

# THE SEWANEE REVIEW

---

VOL. XXI ]

APRIL, 1913

---

[ No. 2

## THE RIVALRY OF GERMANY AND ENGLAND

The commercial supremacy and imperial dominion of Great Britain were made possible by tremendous contests with her rivals on the Continent. In the sixteenth century a hazardous struggle freed her at last from Spain. After a long series of wars she shattered the power of France. In the nineteenth century she was able to check the glacier-like advance of Russia. But at the beginning of the twentieth she was face to face with a danger as pressing and terrible as any which had threatened her before.

The relations of England and Germany attracted little attention until the nineteenth century had come to an end. In the main they were peaceful, inconspicuous, and commonplace. Between Germans and Englishmen existed traditional friendship, with no memory of wars once fought or rivalry maintained. Both were conscious of a certain kinship arising from blood, religion, and speech. Together the two nations had struggled against common enemies. By the aid of England, Frederick the Great had made firm the foundations of Prussia. Side by side the two peoples had liberated Europe from Napoleon. France was their enemy nearest and most dreaded; against France each had an inheritance of fear and a present filled with doubt.

While Germany remained weak and distracted there could, of course, be no serious rivalry, but the establishment of a German Empire seemed at first to bring about no change. The Germans dreaded the revenge of France; England feared the

alliance of France and Russia. While Germany was occupied with the task of upholding the new Empire and in perfecting modern industrial organization, England was striving to preserve naval superiority over the French and Russians. Against these two alone was her two-power standard maintained. Neither on land nor on sea was Germany regarded as a probable enemy. Such was the situation down to about 1900.

Within ten years of this time conditions were entirely changed. Seldom has there been a revolution more rapid and profound. In a single decade England, France, and Russia had put aside their age-long hostility and drawn together in friendliest understanding. In Morocco, in Persia, in the farther corners of the world, the consequences of this change were already manifest. On the other hand the hostility of Germany and England had become threatening and fierce. Against England fleets of German battleships were being built, while from far and near England had drawn in her navies to the Channel and the North Sea to keep perpetual guard against Germany. The centre of politics and world-strife now was somewhere between London and Berlin. Portents were not wanting that the Furies were urging on war for the hegemony of Europe.

And yet, sudden as was this revolution and dire as were its possibilities, when men reviewed the past, they could see clearly how the change had come about. For more than a generation England and Germany had been drawing apart, not because of chance, or dynasty, or personal whim, but because their interests were antagonistic. What with trade rivalry and economic competition they were jostling each other in the market-places of the world, and meeting with jealousy and dislike in the few districts which remained to be apportioned; the one was striving to retain what she had acquired; the other was winning and encroaching and plotting. In diplomacy, in colonial policy, in commerce, in industry, and in finance, in all those things which go to make up power and greatness, Germany and England were seen in rivalry continuous and aggressive. Here were all the elements of an irrepressible conflict.

This hostility rested fundamentally upon the rise of a commercial and industrial Germany having colonial ambitions. It

became critical with the startling development of the German navy.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century England possessed unquestioned preëminence in the world of industry and commerce. As time went on, the United States of America loomed up like a giant in the West, but they were far away and absorbed in themselves. In Europe France was the chief rival, but France had been outdistanced, and now in all respects England was sovereign. Her vessels sailed on every sea. The wares of her cities were sold in every mart of the East and the West. From the profits of her trade and manufacture she waxed strong and mighty and rich. Her population increased wondrously. In all directions English men and women went out to found new Englands, to take possession of decrepit empires and guide the destinies of nations. Such rivalry as England encountered, she overrode. By the sea she was protected; on the sea she found her wealth; on the sea she was supreme.

Then slowly and painfully she became aware of a real opponent and a dangerous enemy. During the last generation of the nineteenth century the German Empire entered upon the course which England had begun earlier. The establishment of the North German Confederation in 1866 was followed by tremendous industrial expansion, but this was soon overshadowed by the mighty outburst after the founding of the Empire in 1871. Cities which had been sleeping since the Thirty Years War became vast emporiums in a single lifetime. All up and down the Rhine there was the smoke and the noise and the hum which the Englishmen had known in the Midlands. Farther east in Prussia and in Saxony huge factories and chimneys dotted the landscape as in Lancashire. Berlin grew faster than any other city in Europe. Whole industries were revolutionized and then gathered to Germany. A teeming population furnished the labor; technical schools and universities gave the skill and the secrets of trade. From far down the scale Germany rose to be the second industrial power in Europe.

The results were soon seen. All over the world goods were sold at lower rates than Englishmen could sell them, and presently a successful invasion was made of the English markets

themselves. It was in vain that Parliament attempted to stigmatize these goods by causing them to be labeled — "Made in Germany;" they were found not merely cheaper but better. The Germans were using greater care and technical skill with less expensive labor, and gradually the commercial predominance of England was shaken. As the pinch of competition was felt, increasing bitterness resulted.

Along with this industrial progress the Germans made gigantic strides in commercial development. In 1860 their foreign trade amounted to two and a half billion marks; in 1900 it had quadrupled. A vast fleet of ships was created. In 1870 the entire German shipping amounted to less than one million tons; in 1900 it was double that much. In 1901 there were of steam vessels alone a million and a half tons. At that time the Germans were building in their own shipyards a hundred thousand tons a year. Much of this wonderful activity was owing to the government, which gave encouragement by subsidy, by state assistance, and by supervision. The results in a single generation were incredible. The Hamburg-American and the North German Lloyd steamship companies ranked among the strongest maritime organizations in the world; Hamburg became the greatest seaport upon the Continent; Germany became the second commercial nation of Europe.

A startling increase in the population, one of the most curious phenomena of recent times, was both the cause and the effect of this industrial expansion. Side by side with a stationary population in France and rapidly increasing numbers in England, the population of Germany increased by leaps and bounds. No other circumstance has so completely altered the balance of power in contemporary Europe. In 1801 the population of France was 27,000,000; by 1910 it had increased to barely 40,000,000. In 1816 there were within the limits of the present German Empire 24,000,000. In 1837 the number had risen to 31,000,000; in 1890, 49,000,000; in 1900, 56,000,000; in 1910, 65,000,000. In 1850 the population was increasing by a quarter of a million a year; in 1911 the increase was nearly a million. It was evident that before long there would be in Germany twice as many people as in France, and then no

military system would avail to offset the numerical superiority. In Great Britain there had been a far greater proportional increase, but whereas in 1801 the population had been 10,500,000, in 1911 it had risen to only 45,000,000. Higher civilization has usually been accompanied by diminishing birthrate, but in Germany this was not so, for reproduction continued with unabated vigor. It was no long time, statisticians said, before there would be 100,000,000 people in the Empire. By the end of the twentieth century there might be twice that many.

The mere physical and economic pressure of such numbers soon becomes terrific, and political conditions must soon be altered profoundly. In the fifth century such an increase brought about the wandering of the nations; in the Middle Ages it sent forth countless multitudes on the Crusades; in the seventeenth century it made possible the aggressions of Louis XIV; at the beginning of the twentieth century it enabled the Hohenzollerns to dream of the dominion of the world.

These new multitudes had to be fed and clothed in a country that was by nature poor. The soil was not fertile; the mines were not rich; there was little virgin or unexploited wealth. In 1905 it was estimated that Germany produced only one-third as much wheat as France. In 1871 half the people of the Empire were engaged in agriculture, but in 1900 scarcely a third. By this time the condition of Germany resembled that of England in so far that vast quantities of food had to be imported from abroad, that these importations had to be purchased with manufactures or bought with ocean-freights, and that great numbers of people would starve if their food-stuffs could not be brought in. Unlike England, however, Germany had no colonies from which to obtain raw materials, and no navy to keep the sea-routes clear.

In Germany colonial ambitions arose too late. England had stretched her dominion around the world before the Germans began the unification of their country. After 1871, while they were occupied in preserving what they had created, France seized upon the most desirable regions remaining. When at last, about 1880, Germany entered the lists, the world had been

preëmpted. The desirable parts of Asia and of Africa that could easily be taken, had been taken by England and by France; while the Monroe Doctrine, like a broad ægis, protected both Americas. There were left only a few tropical districts and a few islands of the sea. Accordingly, the prizes which Germany obtained were insignificant. In 1884 the Cameroons and a part of Guinea were occupied, and in 1886, German East Africa. These gains were almost neutralized, however, by the surrender of Zanzibar in 1890. Later on, a few islands in the Pacific were taken, and in 1897 Kiau Chau and a sphere of influence in China. Though all this was little in comparison with what was held by her rivals, it was nevertheless the beginning of a colonial empire. The trouble was that these possessions were altogether at the mercy of any power strong on the sea.

Toward the end of the nineteenth century the need for a strong navy came to be understood. In widely distant places the Germans were acquiring colonies which they could not defend, while within the Empire great numbers of people depended upon food which could never be imported through the enemy's blockade. The consciousness of these things began after a while to absorb the attention of an influential class.

In the agitation and discussion the Emperor himself took the lead. "The ocean is indispensable to the greatness of Germany," he said in 1900. "As my grandfather reorganized the army, so I shall reorganize my navy." These assertions were the culmination rather than the beginning of a campaign to interest the German people in naval expansion. It was a campaign in which army officers, government officials, and university professors joined. In 1898 Dr. von Schäßle declared that the progress of German commerce had become so immense that Germany must be prepared for anything on the part of her rivals. England "will move heaven and hell against the sea commerce of the new German Empire as soon as she can." Shortly after, Professor Schmoller declared that if Germany was to live and sustain a growing population, she must acquire colonies and she must have a fleet. In 1898 Krupp founded the Flottenverein, or Navy League. In two years it had 600,000

members; in 1910 more than a million. Ceaselessly this organization caused lectures to be delivered, and circulated millions of booklets, many of which were from the first anti-British. This agitation succeeded in every respect, for in a short while the nation was interested, and the creation of a powerful navy became possible.

In the early part of the nineteenth century there was no German fleet in existence. During the plans for the unification of the country, however, the desire for sea power developed, and in 1843 a poet foretold the day when German ships would rule the Baltic. In 1848 the Parliament of Frankfort created a navy, but in the humiliation of the year following, it was sold at auction. Gradually the matter was taken up again, and after the Franco-Prussian War some progress was made. In 1889 the navy was entirely reorganized, and plans were made to enlarge it. In 1895 German sea power was tremendously increased by the opening of the Kiel Canal, which connected the naval bases of Kiel and Wilhelmshaven, and made the entire coast of the Empire a strategic unit. About this time began the propaganda for a much greater fleet. The result was seen in the German Naval Laws of 1898 and 1900.

In 1898 a law passed the Reichstag which provided for the expenditure over a period of years of 1,000,000,000 marks. Warships were to be built rapidly until a certain strength had been attained, after which obsolete vessels were to be replaced, but the fleet was to be enlarged no further. This law, which exceeded even the British Naval Defense Act of 1889, was probably the most ambitious programme undertaken by any state since the days when Themistocles guided the destinies of Athens. It provided for the doubling of the German fleet by 1916. At this time England had 69 battleships; France, 39; Russia, 24; and Germany, 14. The carrying out of this scheme would most probably put Germany in second place.

All this was but the perlude to a mightier effort. In 1899 the Boer War began, and the maritime impotence of Germany was seen more clearly than ever before. Accordingly the nation resolved to submit to still greater burdens, and in 1900 a second naval act was passed. The preamble to the bill stated

that Germany must have a fleet so strong that war with even the mightiest naval power would threaten the existence of that power. More than 1,500,000,000 marks were now appropriated. Where the law of 1898 had provided for 19 battleships and 50 cruisers, the law of 1900 granted 38 battleships and 52 cruisers. Moreover, ample provision was made for arsenals, dock-yards, and equipment. It was evident that Germany desired to achieve upon the water what she had once accomplished on land.

The sudden creation of such vast sea power was in every respect a portentous occurrence, and involved a complete readjustment of the balance of power. All the great nations were affected, and some were alarmed. France and Russia, long accustomed to regard Germany as hostile, now saw her an enemy on the sea also. In the United States it was believed that the Monroe Doctrine was threatened, so that naval activity there was stimulated. In England, when clear realization came, it was believed that the very destiny of the Empire was at stake.

In spite of trade rivalry and commercial competition, the political relations of England and Germany had remained friendly until about this time. France and England were still the enemies, and the possibility of a war between them was a matter of serious concern at this time. But a complete change was brought about by the Boer War. It was afterwards said on the Continent that England in the midst of her perplexity sought the alliance of Germany. However this may be, the subjugation of the Boer farmers aroused in the Empire the liveliest sympathy and an almost universal hatred of the English. Had Germany been able, she might possibly have headed a hostile coalition.

In England this was realized, and when the war was over, it came to be understood that the naval weakness of Germany, which had prevented any action, would soon be a thing of the past. "Germany is making a bold bid for supremacy in the waters we have been accustomed to regard as essentially British," said a writer in 1902. About the same time an author writing upon "Anglophobia in Germany," described the hatred which had long existed, but which recent events had fanned

into a flame. "Let us strengthen our fleet," he said. "It behooves us to be ready." In the great British reviews a series of articles explored every aspect of the subject; in Germany the matter was widely discussed. It was seen that the old conditions were changing, and that the two nations were no longer friends.

Nevertheless, for some time there was in England no sense of peril. Since the battle of Trafalgar, British supremacy had scarcely been disputed. In 1902 this supremacy was still so overwhelming that it was difficult for most Englishmen to conceive of danger. There was, however, a small group of men who, looking into the future, saw the ominous possibilities of what was taking place. Chief among them was King Edward, who now performed his best services for England. With the insight of the true statesman he perceived that England had declined relatively, that she was no longer safe as of old, and that she could not now maintain herself in isolation. Therefore he set about to strengthen England by settling differences and making alliances with those powers whose interests could be reconciled with her interests. This he did with Italy, with Japan, with France, with Russia, and with the United States.

With Italy England had no substantial differences. In 1903 a comprehensive agreement was made concerning the Mediterranean. Between England and France there was much hatred and memory of wrong done in the past, but common interests and the pressure of common danger now drew the two powers together. Moreover, just at this time there appeared in France a statesman, M. Delcassé, who did not despair of raising his country up once more to the position which she had occupied before 1871. He believed that this could be done by the diplomatic isolation of Germany, and by surrounding France with a group of allies. His plan, then, was almost exactly that which Edward VII cherished in England. It was accordingly no difficult matter to conclude an agreement. In 1904 the disputes which had continued for generations, were brought to an end, all outstanding differences were settled, and the two nations entered into the Friendly Understanding, or *Entente Cordiale*. At this time the progress of Russia in eastern Asia had alarmed

both England and Japan, so that in 1905 an alliance between them was made for ten years. Nevertheless, after the situation had been altered by the Russo-Japanese War, England began to seek the friendship of Russia also. This policy, which marked a complete change in British diplomacy, had been urged by a writer as early as 1901. At that time it was impossible, but now with France, the ally of Russia, also the firm friend of England, and with Russia less dangerous on the frontier of India, it was less difficult to come to terms. In 1907, it is said, an understanding was reached about the future spheres of influence in Asia. After this time it was still possible to speak of the Triple Alliance and Dual Alliance; but since now on the one hand England, France, and Russia had drawn together, and on the other hand Italy was less and less closely attached to Austria and Germany, there were as a matter of fact the *Triple Entente* and the alliance of Austria-Hungary with the German Empire. Meanwhile the relations of England with the United States had become so friendly that a war between the two was outside the range of probability. Relying upon this friendship and also upon the Monroe Doctrine, England withdrew her fleets from the Atlantic coast and the Caribbean, and abandoned her naval station at Halifax. Thus, England was no longer isolated and self-sufficient. For good or for ill she had entered the European system.

That Great Britain had really abandoned her isolation, that she was really involved in European politics, and that she was prepared to go far in the support of an ally, was soon evident. The agreement of 1904 had gained for England certain advantages in Egypt and Newfoundland in return for her recognition of French pretensions in Morocco. In 1905, when France was ready to take possession of Morocco, Germany suddenly intervened, and announced to the Sultan that she would uphold his authority. In the crisis which followed, England supported France to the fullest extent, and had France been sufficiently bold, would have joined her in war against Germany. In the Algecirias Conference, which ensued, she continued to play the part of a staunch ally. When, in 1911, the Morocco question came up finally for settlement, and when it seemed that war

could scarcely be avoided, the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer spoke in no uncertain language, and the English fleets were in readiness to sweep the coast of Germany the moment war was declared. How far England was willing to forego her traditional policy for the sake of the friendship of her new allies was seen also in 1911, when Persia was apparently yielded up to Russia to be dealt with as pleased Russia best.

During these years of changing diplomacy the relations with Germany became worse and worse. In 1902 England joined Germany for a moment to coerce Venezuela, but the undertaking was never popular. Kipling denounced it as a league with the Goth and the Hun, and as soon as it was seen that Germany proposed to test the Monroe Doctrine, England withdrew from the enterprise. In the years from 1904 to 1909, Edward VII, who achieved his diplomatic triumphs as much by personal charm as by force and skill, visited Germany several times. On one occasion it was believed that he was trying to make with Germany a comprehensive agreement like that made with France. He was well received, and the visits were returned by the Emperor, but in spite of much cordiality there was no real improvement in the situation.

Every year the agitation in the press of both countries became more virulent. In Germany an exceedingly vigorous propaganda had been carried on since 1898. In England the *London Times* was unwearied in pointing out dangers, while the *National Review* became known as the implacable enemy of Germany. There were not wanting in both countries many who deplored the unfriendly spirit which had arisen, and who asserted that there was no reason why the two nations should not be in friendliest accord. A German writer explained that the new navy grew entirely out of Germany's needs, and was vitally necessary for the defence of her seacoast against the fleets of the Dual Alliance. Nevertheless, in England and elsewhere it was believed that in a peculiar sense the building of this gigantic navy was directed against Great Britain. In 1905 an anonymous writer in *Kringsjaa* explained that Germany had need of a powerful fleet to insure her coast against a blockade,

so as to guarantee the continued importation of the food upon which her industrial population depended, and that the enemy whom she must particularly fear was England. In times past England had destroyed the maritime power of Spain, of Holland, of France, and of Denmark in turn. Unless the Germans could immediately make their fleet too strong to be attacked, they would probably suffer the same fate. It was unfortunate that they had not gone farther before they were observed.

The years from 1902 to 1912 were years of constantly increasing anxiety on the part of England, and constantly increasing boldness in Germany. The period may be divided into two parts: first, the years before 1907, during which England became more and more alarmed, though still confident of her superiority; and secondly, the years from 1907 on, during which the island empire underwent a panic of fear and depression.

In 1905 Sir Robert Reid, writing in the *Deutsche Revue*, strongly deprecated the acute situation which had arisen, but at the same time confessed that it was widely believed in England that the Germans might make a sudden descent upon England, while many people in Germany believed that the English were meditating the destruction of the German fleet. About the same time there was a heated debate in Parliament during which the possibility of foreign invasion was discussed. It will always be a question whether during these years the press of the two countries acted with far-seeing patriotism in calling attention to the dangers which were beginning to appear, but which many people could not perceive, or whether it played a mischievous part in creating the hostility which it incessantly described. At all events, the papers ceased not for a moment to fan suspicion into a flame. It was in vain that well-meaning persons tried to restore good feeling. In 1906 a large number of German editors and town officials visited London, while on both sides of the North Sea prominent men stated earnestly the reasons why the two nations should be friends. All the while the *National Review* and the *Contemporary Review* taught that Germany was the deadly enemy of their country, while in Germany there were unceasing attacks upon England as the great obstacle in Germany's way.

In both countries the building of battleships went on apace. In 1905 the German estimates called for an expenditure of 228,000,000 marks, having increased by four times in the past five years. England had at the start, however, so great a superiority that it was not difficult for her to keep far ahead. There was no doubt that she had a new and dangerous enemy, and that she had not yet adjusted herself to the situation, but most Englishmen believed that they had no reason to fear if they kept vigilantly on the guard. Suddenly there occurred an event which brought about an entire change in the situation.

The Russo-Japanese War was the first great war which had been fought since the struggle between Germany and France in 1870. It was marked by intelligent and effective use for the first time of numberless new appliances and new ideas. It was, therefore, immensely important in that it revealed the methods and possibilities of modern warfare. In no respect was this so true as it was of naval contests. After the battle of Tsushima it was seen that high speed, long range, and weight of metal involved decisive superiority on the sea. As allies of the Japanese, the English first adopted these ideas and put them into practice. In 1907 they completed a battleship which was by far the largest and most heavily armored war vessel which had ever been put afloat, and which had greater speed than any battleship before that time. Where previously armaments had consisted of a large number of guns of different calibre, this ship possessed a small number of very heavy guns, and a large number of small ones. In short, here was a battleship invulnerable to the attacks of other vessels, able to overtake or out-speed an antagonist, always able to choose its own range, and out of range of the enemy's guns, batter the enemy to pieces. All at once the navies of the world became antiquated, for such a ship was superior to a whole squadron of the older vessels. In the history of naval architecture the launching of the Dreadnought is as important as the combat of the Monitor and the Virginia in Hampton Roads.

From this splendid triumph England was soon thrust down into an abyss of despair. For the moment she possessed an invincible warship, but in reality she had done herself a deadly

harm. The Dreadnought had made previous battleships of relatively small account: of such ships England had the largest number, and by means of them she maintained her superiority over Germany. That the new model would be universally followed was evident, for all over the world the great nations at once laid down superdreadnoughts and battleships of stupendous dimensions. In Germany the new ships were all designed to be of the new type, and the building programme was accelerated. It was the peculiar misfortune of England that she taught the world to build ships that would make her own navy ineffective, at the very time when her most dangerous enemy was building the largest number of ships.

After a while this was realized in England, and then at last there settled down upon the island a black depression such as had not been seen since the days of Napoleon I. Actually England's naval supremacy was seriously threatened, and threatened by a rival with whom she was no longer on friendly terms. The newspapers discussed the matter more than any other topic. Public men vied with each other in pessimistic utterance. In 1907 Rudolph Martin, commenting upon the anti-German policy of Edward VII, said: "This policy will be modified before the imminence of a war with Germany, or after the first results of such a war. If not, we shall descend upon England." In the year following, Lord Cromer predicted a great war, and said that England should make herself ready. A year later Lord Roseberry declared that the situation was ominous. About the same time Dr. Gerhardt von Schulze-Gaevernitz was of the opinion that "Peace is indeed endangered, but war is not absolutely unavoidable."

As yet, it is not possible to know just what was the policy of the German government; whether it was building its mighty fleet for the overthrow of England, or merely for the protection of its existing interests. There is no doubt that many Germans had no desire and no intention to strike at England. Nevertheless, it could not be forgotten that the German Empire had reached the splendid position which it occupied by striking down each nation that stood in its way. On land, by a series of terrible blows, it had overthrown Denmark, Austria, and

France. Now that it was about to seek its destiny upon the waters, must not England be the foe whom it would next seek out? It might well be that the Empire stood for peace, and that the German people and the German Emperor desired peace; it could not be forgotten that this Empire was growing and expanding and aggressive, and that hitherto it had taken by force what it had needed.

It was in this spirit that Englishmen received assurances from the Kaiser himself. On March 6, 1908, the *London Times* announced that the German Emperor had tried to influence British policy by secret correspondence with the First Lord of the Admiralty. The letters proved to be of a personal nature, but scarcely had the excitement died down, when the Emperor with great frankness and indiscretion granted an interview to a representative of the *Daily Telegraph*. He declared that he desired peace, but that the majority of his people regarded England as a hostile country. Whatever may have been the meaning of this, Englishmen felt that it was a warlike manifesto. The whole country was in a tumult.

British statesmen now spoke in no undecided manner. In November, Lord Roberts in the House of Lords proposed that England should raise an army of 1,000,000 men to cope with a possible invasion. "It is my absolute belief," he said, that "without a military organization more adequate to the certain perils of the future our empire will fall away from us and our power pass away." In the following August he advocated universal conscription. As of old, however, most Englishmen were inclined to rely upon their ships. "If the navy fails it will be useless to discuss any other subject." Mr. Asquith defined the two-power standard as a ten per cent superiority in capital ships over the combined strength of the next two powers. At the moment, however, this was gone. At the present rate of building, Germany would soon have more dreadnoughts than England, while Austria was about to build four, which could certainly be counted in the German column. England must enlarge her programme.

The naval burden had now become so grievous that it was not easy to increase it. The cost of battleships had risen

prodigiously. Moreover, the British government had undertaken comprehensive social legislation, which made the budget still greater. Already the government was facing a deficit at the same time that consols were selling at eighty-three.

Just at this juncture the country was thrilled by a writer who succeeded in bringing to the heart of the nation what was alarming so many. In the early part of 1909 appeared the play, "An Englishman's Home." It came out anonymously, but was at once ascribed to Guy de Maurier. From the point of view of dramatic excellence it was crude and of trifling merit, but it carried a powerful appeal, and it came at the critical moment. A nation defenceless yet confident; a country gentleman, bluff, hearty, and self-reliant, shot at last by the enemy for defending his home. This was enough. In London it was played to crowded houses, and then taken into the provinces. For a while the newspapers discussed little else. It was rumored afterward that the English government, desiring to arouse the country, had urged the writing of such a work. If this be true, they succeeded in their design, for England was aroused at last.

It is characteristic of Englishmen that at times they depreciate and decry themselves unduly, seeing the present as dark and the future as hopeless. This was so during the naval panic of 1909. It might have seemed that an invasion from Germany was momentarily expected. In Berlin, *Ulk* suggested that every night England be locked up in its strongest bank for safe keeping. A cartoon in the same paper showed Englishmen madly bailing out the Thames in search of German spies. In *Amsterdammer* an artist drew a British Lion dashing about with a German warship tied to his tail. Lord Roberts insisted upon a great army. The Secretary for War asked for 300,000 territorial troops, and the London *Times* advocated compulsory service. The government immediately decided to build five instead of four dreadnoughts, and presently proposed the construction of eight in the current year. The debate in the House of Commons took place before crowded galleries. The First Lord of the Admiralty declared that it could not be known how fast Germany was building her fleet, but that Germany bade fair soon to have the most powerful navy in the world.

Mr. Balfour, leader of the Opposition, asserted that England must strain every nerve now to maintain even the one-power standard in first-class ships. Sir Edward Grey said that the fleet should be rebuilt.

From this time on there is in English public life a certain note of hopelessness and depression. The race is beginning to tell. Germany is just behind, and cannot be shaken off. At the Second Hague Conference in 1907 England had proposed the limitation of armaments, but Germany refused absolutely to consider it. In 1909 Grand Admiral von Koester declared that such an understanding with England was impossible, since Germany could not enter into it without permanently endangering her prestige. Some Germans boasted that England could not always keep ahead. This was believed by many Englishmen, who declared that salvation lay in sweeping away the German navy before it became any larger. Some Germans, indeed, were amazed that England suffered their fleet to increase. To-day you might destroy us, but not to-morrow, said one of them exultantly. It is possible that this explains in part England's zeal for France during the trouble about Morocco.

There was much reason for pessimism, since Germany was moving on with giant strides. Every year saw an increase in her commerce, her manufactures, her national wealth, her population, her army, and her navy. On the Continent France still lay under the tradition of 1871. After the war with Japan, Russia was for a time eliminated from European politics. On the other hand Austria and Germany had drawn together in close alliance, with Germany as leader. At the behest of the Kaiser 7,000,000 men could take the field. It might seem to those who stayed to look that Germany was standing across central Europe like a colossus, with face toward the sea, and shadow lying darkest over England.

On both sides of the North Sea naval activity was redoubled. In Germany the finances became more and more confused, and in England the burden ever harder to bear. The Elbe and the Clyde resounded with blows as when the thunder-bolts were forged against the Titans. Among Englishmen a new foreign policy had developed, the corner-stone of which was opposition

to Germany and resolution to maintain constant superiority over her fleet. Particularly was this so after the wrath aroused in Germany because of England's attitude in 1911. The Admiralty's standard was declared to be a sixty per cent lead over the next greatest naval power.

This was clear in 1912, when English public men made utterances in which Germany was explicitly mentioned. In February, Winston Churchill, speaking at Glasgow, declared that the British navy was a necessity, the German a luxury. To the Germans it meant expansion; to England, existence. All the treasure and power, he said, which had been accumulated through so many centuries of sacrifice, would be swept away if naval supremacy were impaired for a moment. England would welcome limitation of armaments, but her superiority she would certainly maintain. A month later he announced that naval expansion would be regulated entirely now by the number of warships constructed in Germany. If the Germans accelerated their programme, the English would not only lay down more battleships, but would make the increase greater proportionately. "If this is insular arrogance, it is also the first condition of our existence." About this time Lord Haldane, Secretary for War, went to Berlin for the purpose of arriving at some lasting agreement. But meanwhile the surplus of the British Exchequer was set aside for more ships, if they should be needed.

Neither conciliation nor firmness had any effect. The attitude of England during the Morocco crisis had caused a passion of anger in Germany, so that now she would listen to nothing. "The German people know who it is that wants to hold universal sway when Germany desires to expand in the world," said Herr von Heydebrand in the Reichstag. "The German people will know how to give a German answer." This was in November, 1911. Almost at the same time appeared a book by General Bernhardt, a distinguished officer, in which it was asserted that Germanism must be propagated by the sword, and that such conquest was desirable. First France must be overthrown so completely that she could never get in the way again. Then would come the reckoning with England. While this book was being read, increased naval estimates were announced in Ger-

many, whereupon in England the surplus was at once diverted to the construction of additional battleships.

And so at last it had come to this, that the two greatest nations of Europe, the two which should be the leaders of its civilization, were in deadly antagonism, with each thinking most about its rival. From the Atlantic, from the Mediterranean, from the China seas, England had drawn her war fleets in an ever-increasing cordon around the British Isles. Feverishly new ships were being constructed; zealously new naval bases were prepared. All of this was avowedly against Germany. And beyond the North Sea millions of German artisans and peasants were paying hunger taxes to build fleets against England. What would be the outcome of this? A war between the two would be a world disaster, incalculable in its horror and destruction, while not less calamitous would be the obliteration of England under a triumphant German civilization.

As the historian reaches the immediate present, he cannot pierce the veil before him except by prophecy, and such prophecy is idle and fruitless. Nevertheless, whatever comes, it may well be that future writers looking back will declare that the most ominous thing in European politics at the beginning of the twentieth century was the dangerous rivalry of Germany and England.

EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER.

University of Michigan.

## DOWN-HILL WORDS

A man's language is an integral part of himself and draws its identity from him. Words which, spoken by a person of meagre mind and tepid emotion, seem light and aimless as thistledown, spoken by a person of strong personality come to us with terrific impact. It has been pointed out that the word "glory" predominates in all of Napoleon's dispatches, while in the dispatches of Wellington the key-word is "duty." The Battle of Waterloo is comprehended in that antithesis. A man who knew Webster well declared that each of his words weighed a pound. It was said of Montaigne that such is the vitality of his words if you cut them they will bleed. Emerson said concerning the power of personality in language: "Through every clause and part of speech of a right book, we meet the eyes of the most determined of men: his force and terror inundate every word; the commas and dashes are alive."

Just as the words of an individual derive their character and specific gravity from him, so the vocabulary of a race derives its collective range and intensity from the people as a whole. The English language is nothing but an enormous collection of verbal symbols into which have been poured fifteen centuries of the animal, intellectual, and spiritual experiences of the Anglo-Saxon race. Each syllable speaks with the eloquence of a thousand tongues and the emotion of a million hearts. The whole tissue of our racial life has woven itself into a colored web of associations and memories, and our vocabulary reflects this web, colors and all, with absolute accuracy. The truest history of any nation is its dictionary.

The dictionary is not only a national history. It is a national autobiography, an autobiography which continues to write itself as long as the nation remains a nation and its tongue is a living tongue. Of the many interesting elements in this autobiography the most significant are the shifts in meaning and in connotation which certain words and groups of words have undergone. It is an interesting psychological study to compare the meanings of Chaucer's words and Shakespeare's words with the meanings which those same words bear to-day.

One striking fact that becomes evident at the outset is that nearly all of these changes are for the worse. Words show an unmistakable tendency to go down hill. The doctrine of innate depravity seems to hold good for language. Words that were once bright and strong and pure, grow dim and worn by use until they become only melancholy shadows of their former selves. Human weaknesses and frailties seem to rest so heavily upon them that they bend and break under the load. Like a once fortunate family whose wealth is gone and whose name has become tarnished, they sink to lower and lower depths, drawing about themselves to the last the rags of their former respectability till finally they become utterly outcast and abandoned.

One interesting little group of five that have lost their first sharpness and distinctiveness are the time-words *soon*, *bye* and *bye*, *presently*, *directly*, and the archaic *anon*. When they first came into use each of these meant "immediately, at once." So lazy is man, however, so prone to delay, that one after the other they all acquired from him the habit of procrastination and ended by taking on their present meaning of "in a moment, after a little while."

Another family that have fallen from their first estate of charity and tolerance and that now wear suspicious, disagreeable faces, are *criticism*, *censure*, *prejudice*, and *doom*. At first these were open-minded and kind-hearted, willing to give one the benefit of the doubt; but either because, in the words of Chaucer, people "demen gladly to the badder ende," or because harsh judgments stick in the mind longer than pleasant ones, all four terms came to mean "blame, condemnation," instead of simply "judgment, estimation of the value of." *Doom* has acquired a very strong tinge of condemnation and is almost equivalent to "damnation." Its original meaning of "judgment" is found only in such petrified phrases as *crack of doom*, and *day of doom*, referring to the Last Judgment.

A third group, which seem to cast grave doubt upon the honesty of mankind, are *artful*, *crafty*, *cunning*, *designing*, *knowing*, *sly*, *tricky*, and *wily*. This whole family went down hill very early. With the possible exception of *tricky* and *wily*, they all meant originally "endowed with unusual skill, knowledge, or

intelligence." Human nature, alas, is weak, and the inference was clear that one who had the advantage of his neighbor in knowledge or skill would take advantage of him in other ways. Hence it comes about that it is now no compliment to be called either *artful*, *crafty*, *cunning*, or *sly*. An early example of *sly*, used in the good sense of "wise," occurs in the famous Middle English poem, *The Debate of the Body and the Soul*, written late in the thirteenth century. The passage is found in stanza fifty-six and reads as follows:—

"Jesus who sittest on high,  
On me, thy creature, now have mercy.  
Didst not thou create me, who art so sly?"

*Daft*, *silly*, *simple* and *innocent*, the antonyms of the *artful*, *sly*, *crafty* group, went through exactly the opposite changes and for the same psychological cause. The two groups taken together aptly illustrate the text, "The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light." *Daft*, *silly*, *simple*, *innocent* were all complimentary at first. *Daft* meant "mild, meek." *Silly* meant "happy, blessed," and then "ingenuous, guileless." *Simple* implied merely "unsophisticated, natural, artless." *Innocent* meant solely "free from moral wrong, sinless, harmless." But alas, again, for the frailty of man! The credulous, unsuspecting person is ever the sport or prey of his shrewder companions, and the person who regularly gets the worst of things soon comes to be regarded with scorn or pity. Hence the idea of guilelessness in these words was overshadowed by the idea of weakness and folly, and *daft* and *silly* assumed their present imputation of "destitute of ordinary good sense, easily deceived, feeble-minded." *Simple* and *innocent* have not gone nearly so far down hill, but they have already made one or two missteps. It will be interesting to watch their further career. There is, by the way, little choice in the dilemma offered in these two groups. Let a man be wise as a serpent and he is considered wise at the expense of others; that is, *sly*, *crafty*. Let him be harmless as a dove and others are wise at the expense of his innocence and folly. It is merely a choice between the active and passive voices: bite or be bitten!

Though it seems a sad commentary on human nature that these word families have acquired habits of flaziness, fault-finding, and unscrupulousness from man, there is worse to come. Biggest and blackest of all is the long roll of sex-words. Sex smuts words more rapidly and completely than does any other agency. Let a word be exposed never so slightly to the contagion of pruriency, and its fate is sealed. It becomes unclean and has to be quarantined at once. Many a fine old word has succumbed in this way. From the long and unsavory list may be chosen only *lust*, *passion*, *wanton*, *lewd*, *vulgar*, *suggestive*, *libertine*, *wench*, *hussy*, and *paramour*.

The case of *lust* is both sad and typical. Originally it was a splendid, vigorous word and gave promise of a long, useful life. In its youth it meant "strong pleasure, strong desire." About the year 1200, for example, Orm mentioned among the Seven Goodnesses of Christ the fact that He sent the Holy Spirit to give His followers "good lust, good power, to suffer all woes." In the *Ayenbite of Inwit* (Remorse of Conscience), a religious work of about 1340, the heart and spirit of man are spoken of as having their "abiding place, their solace, their bliss, and their comfort and all their lusts" in paradise. Chaucer even uses the word to mean "pleasure or interest in a story," advising us in the Squire's Tale that it is not well to delay the point of a story "till that the lust of those who have listened to it for a long time be cold." Soon, however, its present highly specialized—and highly disagreeable—meaning crept in and drove out all others except in certain phrases like the "lust of battle." The word is now socially dead and its case is hopeless, for words that die of this poison "do seldom or never recover."

*Passion* is another fine old word that has become smutted with the idea of sex. Its earliest meanings were two: "suffering," as in "Passion Play," and "strong emotion," as in the Shakespearean "tear a passion to tatters." It is an interesting bit of psychology that the emotions which proved strongest in the case of this word and which accordingly fixed its present meaning are anger and sexual love. Of the two the latter seems as always to be showing its greater strength and endurance over all rivals and is gaining complete possession. By

the end of another century the word will probably be lying in the gutter with *lust*.

The adjectives *wanton*, *lewd*, *vulgar*, and *suggestive* have gone the same down-hill road. *Wanton* and *lewd* were first cousins in meaning and of poor but respectable origin. Both began by meaning "ignorant." *Wanton* is etymologically the exact Anglo-Saxon equivalent of the Latin *uneducated*. From its primary meaning of "untrained" developed rapidly the idea of "sportive, irresponsible," then "wild, unrestrained," and finally "licentious, unchaste." Its lighter meaning of "gay, sportive," is to be found, for example, in Chaucer's description of his merry Friar:—

"Somewhat he lipped for his wantownesse  
To make his Englissh swete upon his tonge."

*Lewd* likewise meant "lay, as opposed to clerical, ignorant, unlearned." The author of the thirteenth century prose *Life of Saint Juliana* explains in the introduction that he has turned the *Life* into English for the sake of "lewd men who cannot understand the Latin tongue." *Lewd* and *learned* were often used in Middle English as a full phrase for "all the people." In his English Proclamation of 1258 Henry III sends greetings "to all his faithful, learned and lewd, in Huntingdonshire." The later development of both *wanton* and *lewd* would seem to indicate that there is small bliss in ignorance. Whether or not, however, an argument for compulsory education could be based on their history, both words are certainly in disgrace now.

*Vulgar* and *suggestive* are tarred with the same stick. *Vulgar* began by meaning "characteristic of the common people, common." The extension of meaning to "low, base, coarse," was inevitable and rapid. Instances of arrested development showing the better side of the word occur in the phrases *vulgar tongue*, *vulgar fractions*, and *Vulgar Errors*, the title of one of Sir Thomas Browne's lesser known works. *Suggestive* is not so badly off-color as any of the five words first mentioned, but its foothold on the slope of respectability is fast growing precarious. It is really needed as a weaker synonym of inspiring, and of course means, or ought to mean, "mentally stimulating." It is, however, specializing in the wrong direction and is on the point

of becoming a polite epithet for the type of stories associated with the names of Boccaccio, Sterne, and de Maupassant.

The remaining words in this group, *libertine*, *wench*, *hussy*, and *paramour*, require only brief mention. They are all in bad odor and for the same reason. None of them was markedly complimentary even in the beginning, and their fall was not unnatural. *Paramour* was once much the noblest of the four. It was originally the old French adverbial phrase *par amour*, and signified "in the way of love, devotedly, longingly." For example, in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*, Arcite says to Palamon concerning Emily, "For par amour I loved her first ere thou." And in speaking of the charms of Sir Thopas, his burlesque hero, Chaucer says,—

"Full many a maiden, bright in bower,  
They mourn for him paramour,  
When they had better be asleep."

Later, *paramour* lost its adverbial force, became a noun and fell from grace.

With this group we may end our survey of down-hill words. In looking back over the family history of all five groups we might conclude that man is but a shiftless, suspicious, unscrupulous, and licentious creature after all, and that his iniquity is heavily visited upon language. The evidence is misleading. Nor is this down-hill tendency of words due to the natural wear and tear of time. It is true that all machinery either wears out or rusts out, and it would be strange if human speech, which of all machines invented by man is the most powerful, the most complex, and the most delicate, did not also become somewhat worn and rusted with age. Although both these causes may have contributed, the chief reason why words degenerate is strangely enough nothing else than man's instinct of politeness in speech. This is a paradox, but it is true. It is euphemism, the pleasant saying of unpleasant things, which is responsible after all. No one likes to be disagreeable if he can help it, and when people have to speak of offensive or embarrassing subjects, they are at pains to find mild, delicate, and indirect terms. Everybody had rather be called plain than ugly, or fast than dissipated, or strong-willed than obstinate, or thrifty than stingy.

It is both politer and safer to say that a man is exceedingly economical in the use of truth than to give him the lie direct. Delicacy merging into prudery has made it the approved thing to say "retire" rather than "go to bed," and to speak not of "legs" but of "limbs." And when it comes to the question of our pet failings and vices, we are all like Shakespeare's rogue Pistol who would have none of the crude word steal: "'Convey,' the wise call it," he expostulated to the blunt-spoken Nym, "'Steal!' foh! a fico for the phrase!"

Now let a word be employed as a euphemism often enough and it ceases to be euphemistic. The harsher meaning creeps in and displaces the original softened meaning. Take, for example, the case of *sly* and *artful*. The first few times an unscrupulous schemer was called *sly* or *artful*, his dishonesty seemed palliated, even applauded, by the complimentary term. It is safe to say, however, that people who had dealings with him soon learned that to speak of him as *sly* rather than as *dishonest* was a distinction without a difference. It never takes long to detect a wolf in sheep's clothing, for his teeth by any other name remain as sharp and bite as successfully.

Working thus between the extremes of politeness and delicacy on the one hand, and flattery, hypocrisy, and prudery on the other, euphemism lays hold of word after word and in the end degrades it. Its influence upon our vocabulary has been subtle and far-reaching, and will continue so as long as English is a living tongue. Happily our language is sturdy and vigorous enough and our race young and virile enough to repair all such inroads upon our stock of words. Our language is safe as long as our race is sound, for words cannot go down hill if men remain on the heights.

REED SMITH.

University of South Carolina.

## A FRIENDSHIP AND ITS FRUITS

The literature of the nineteenth century more than that of any other literary period, touched perfectly every phase of human experience and sympathy. Musicians tell us that the great masters have covered every possible combination of harmonics, and, in quite the same way, carrying the idea across into the field of letters, it would seem not difficult of proof that this is true of the writers of the later Georgian and entire Victorian eras. It would appear, too, as the student looks more closely into the causes of this highly perfected and wide expression of written thought, that one contributing agency, not the least potent, was the warm fellow-feeling and intellectual sympathy exhibited in many instances, and it is easy to see how an intercommunion based on this could produce just what was produced — a living atmosphere in books.

For instance, Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen enjoyed the admiration and friendship of Sir Walter Scott, the latter even acknowledging that to Miss Edgeworth's description of Irish character and manners he was indebted for the inspiration which led him to attempt and carry out, to the undying delight of readers, the delineation of Scottish life and character in the *Waverley* Novels. Sir Walter also repeatedly acknowledged the admiration he had for the skilful creator of Collins, Ben-net, and Darcy in *Pride and Prejudice*. There is no doubt that the intimate association of Leigh Hunt, Keats, and Shelley contributed greatly to the work of each, for it is well known that the peculiarly musical versification in Hunt's *Rimini* strongly influenced the subsequent poetry of both his friends. Yet further confirmation of this idea lies in the ideal intellectual sympathy which existed between Robert Browning and Elizabeth Barrett, consummated at last in a "marriage of the poets", and in the fact that, from a score of points, they played an important part in the life of Tennyson.

The whole civilized world, however, is this year thinking especially of that great master player on the gamut of humanities, Charles Dickens, and it comes with particular appropriateness

to speak of anything or anybody close to him. His friendships were many, but, though he had fellowship with Carlyle, Hunt, Macaulay, Sidney Smith, and most of the great writers of his day, the connection which seems, next to that with Forster, to have produced the most positive and lasting expression of mutual esteem, sympathy, and help, was the one formed with a kindly, bespectacled little man, with black hair and beard and large white forehead, owning a name now known far and wide among the lovers of books — Wilkie Collins.

They came together in 1851, when Collins was twenty-six and Dickens forty, and they remained together until death parted them; the ties of friendship being in time even more closely knit by the marriage of Charles Collins, brother of the younger of the associates, and his senior's daughter. At this period "Boz" was at the height of his reputation, having produced *Pickwick*, *Oliver Twist*, *Nicholas Nickleby*, *Barnaby Rudge*, *Old Curiosity Shop*, *Martin Chuzzlewit*, *Christmas Carol*, *Dombey and Son*, and *David Copperfield*. The other was comparatively unknown in the literary world, for the total of his work was summed up in a life of his father, William, the landscape painter; *Antonina, or the Fall of Rome*, a classic romance of the fifth century, which fell rather flat; and *Rambles beyond Railways, or Notes in Cornwall*. Collins's early life had been influenced by the cultured and artistic tastes of his father, and of his god-father, David Wilkie, the noted Scotch artist, and, whilst the refinement and mental charm due to this undoubtedly appealed to the elder of the friends, it is fair to assume that what first attracted the big-hearted Dickens were the early uncertainties and struggles which Collins had encountered. The former saw in these a similarity to his own youth, and the sympathy thus begotten paved the way to a discovery of many things in common. For the author of *Pickwick* had tried law and parliamentary reporting before he settled down to writing, and the future author of *The Moonstone* was an articled clerk in a city tea house, and afterwards (to please his father, who was opposed to the profession of letters) was entered at Lincoln's Inn, being in due time admitted to the bar, although he never practised.

Both had the dramatic instinct and both loved the theatre. Dickens, indeed, would have become a professional actor had he not obtained employment as a reporter before arrangements with the manager of Covent Garden could be consummated. Early in the intimacy of the two, they were found in amateur theatricals at Tavistock House and elsewhere, and Collins wrote two melodramas for the performances, *The Light House* and *The Frozen Deep*, the latter ultimately finding its way to the public stage. But all this is not enough to account for the inception of an intimacy between two men of strong distinctive individualities. It is necessary to dig deeper and find what influences breathed into it the fervor which induced Dickens to invite his younger friend to join him in editing *Household Words* (afterwards *All the Year Round*) and writing for it, to send him countless letters brimming over with suggestions and praise, to join him in journeys abroad and in "sprees" to the theatre at home, and to collaborate with him, as late as '67, in producing the interesting and strongly marked *No Thoroughfare*, afterwards dramatized and produced.

One finds, in studying carefully the works of these two novelists, that the influences referred to lay in what may be called an intellectual mutuality. The one had marked gifts of conception and execution which the other lacked. It is conceded that Collins gave a new turn and direction to the method and coloring of Dickens's work from *Bleak House* to *Edwin Drood*, and it is equally clear that the former grew steadily under the domination of the Dickensian dramatic force and humor from his earliest serious novel *Basil* to the consummation of his artistry in *The Moonstone*. This is said of both, however, with the distinct reservation that, in this helpful association, neither lost anything of his originality as a writer.

Dickens was a genius, not only in humor, but in sentiment. He idealized humor and virtue and excoriated vice. Therefore, up to the writing of *Bleak House*, and with the exception probably of *Edith Dombey*, his people impress one more as lively embodiments of abstract qualities and emotions, contributing to a well-defined and easily felt atmosphere of the emotions, than as fully rounded out men and women. Pecksniff,

Carker, Sykes, Fagan, and Quilp appeal to the reader as noxious influences, and Pickwick, Dick Swiveller, Sam Weller, Little Nell, Captain Cuttle, and the Cheeryble brothers as the good influences of humor, pathos, and virtue. His picture of an inn, for example, shows this extraordinary skill for creating atmosphere. Nobody has ever felt how much real good he could get in "the lounge" of a country "pub," beside a warm stove with a hot drink handy, until he has read *The Pickwick Papers* and *Barnaby Rudge* and has sat down in "The White Hart," "The Magpie and Stump," or "The Maypole" along with the jolly, odd creatures inspired by this great believer in the potentiality of kindness, fellowship, and good cheer.

But as *Bleak House*, *Little Dorrit*, *A Tale of Two Cities*, *Great Expectations*, and *Our Mutual Friend*, appeared, between 1853 and 1865, a marked tendency toward individualization was observed, and a further disposition to concentrate effects in a succession of skilfully arranged scenes. Such were the great word duel between Tulkinghorn and Lady Dedlock in the turret room at Chesney Wold, the scene between Sidney Carton and Lucy Manette in the early part of *The Tale of Two Cities*, that between Carton and Darnay in the French prison, and the very great picture at the scaffold. In *Great Expectations*, too, there is that magnificently human drama in the passage between the ghostly Miss Havisham,—a veritable "Woman in White," dressed in her faded bridal finery, reminiscent of a heart long broken,—and Pips and Estrella.

The man who has been credited with thus helping to bring out more fully the powers of his great contemporary has been subject to various criticisms in his own work. Shortly after his death a writer in the *Spectator* gave this clever summary of it: "He was a literary chess-player of the first force, with power of carrying his plan right through the game and making every move tell. His method was to introduce a certain number of characters, set before them a well-defined object, such as the discovery of a secret, the revindication of a fortune, the tracking of a crime, or the establishment of a doubted marriage, and then bring in other characters to resist or counteract their efforts. Each side makes moves, almost invariably good; the

interest goes on accumulating till the looker-on—the reader is always placed in that attitude—is rapt out of himself by strained attention; and then there is a sudden and totally unexpected mate. It is chess which is being played; and in the best of all his stories, the one which will live for years, *The Moonstone*, the pretense that it is anything else is openly disregarded." Charles Reade placed Collins next to Dickens and said of him: "An artist of the pen; there are terribly few among writers." Mrs. Oliphant's judgment was that "He was an artist of plot. He did not possess the still more interesting and far higher gift of creation. There is no character, no living being in his works with the exception perhaps of Count Fosco." Swinburne said: "It is apparently the general opinion, an opinion which seems to me incontestable, that no third book of their author's can be ranked as equal with *The Woman in White* and *The Moonstone*, two works of not more indisputable than incomparable ability. *No Name* is an only less excellent example of as curious and original talent."

Whilst it is true that Collins is a master in plot construction, he became something infinitely more, despite Mrs. Oliphant. For in order to justify a fame lasting to this time, it is necessary that he should have served letters far better than in the mere construction of a clever scheme of incidents; there must have been something in his books of the air one breathes and the people one meets and knows. And this is so, for though he had not at any time the warmth of portrayal of his illustrious friend, he had the gift, strongly marked, of putting the traits and emotions, so well understood by the latter, into flesh and blood embodiments, of constructing characters who lived the story he had to tell, and who made a distinct atmosphere for it.

Of *Hide and Seek*, which appeared as early as 1854, Dickens himself wrote: "I think it far away the cleverest novel I have ever seen written by a new hand. It is in some respects masterly. Valentine Blythe is as original and as well done as anything can be. The scene where he shows his pictures is full of an admirable humor. Old Mat is admirably done. In short, I call it a very remarkable book and have been very much surprised by its great merit." But it was when *The Woman in*

*White* appeared a half dozen years later that the true genius of the man and the Dickensian influence upon him were both first made manifest. It is in the phrasing and lively delineation that one sees this rather than in similarity of character treatment, though there is a touch of Skimpole in the self-centred but gentlemanly Fairlie, a suggestion of Mantalini in the mannerisms of Fosco, and a composite photography of the older women in the books of Boz in Mrs. Vesey who "sat through life". The exquisite vein of satire running through the conception of Fairlie, whose lament is that "It is the grand misfortune of my life that nobody will leave me alone;" the magnificent contrast between grace, villainy, and humor in Fosco; the wonderfully speaking portraits of Marian Holcombe, Madame Fosco, and Mrs. Catherick, though all the work of Collins breathe in a measure the spirit of Dickens. Of the action in the book, the picture of Laura Fairlie, walking all in white, in the moonlight on the terrace, while Marian Holcombe is reading from a letter concerning Annie Catherick, "The Woman in White," to Walter Hartright; Fosco's postscript to Miss Holcombe's Diary; the great dialogue between Hartright and Mrs. Catherick, and the letter of Mrs. Catherick to Hartright have a dramatic fervor born of the power of combining plot and scenic coloring with a strong human sympathy.

Concerning this novel Dickens wrote to his friend: "I have read this book with great care and attention. There can be no doubt that it is a very great advance on all your former writing, and most especially in respect to tenderness. In character it is excellent. Mr. Fairlie is as good as the lawyer and the lawyer is as good as he. Mrs. Vesey and Miss Holcombe, in their different ways, equally meritorious. Sir Percival, also, is most skilfully drawn, though I doubt (you see what small points I come to) whether any man ever showed uneasiness by hand or foot without being forced by nature to show it in his face too." This letter must have grown out of consultations between the two during the making of the story, because, after it had been written, Dickens was appealed to for the name which would best advertise it to the world. As he was unable to suggest anything suitable, John Forster, the original of Mr. Pickwick, was

approached, but, though he was apt in the matter of titles, he could do nothing here. The little author was desperate, and one day started for Broadstairs with a determination not to return until a title had been found. For a long time he walked along the cliff and finally, as the sun went down, threw himself on the grass. He was facing the North Foreland Light-house, and half unconsciously began to apostrophize it in this way: "You are ugly and stiff and awkward, you know; as stiff and as weird as my white woman—white woman—woman in white—the title, by Jove!"

After this story had been published the author received a letter from a lady. She began by congratulating him somewhat coldly upon his success, and then said: "But, Mr. Collins, the great failure of your book is your villain. Your Count Fosco is a very poor one, and when next you want a character of that description, I trust that you will not disdain to come to me, I know a villain, and have one in my eye at this moment that would far eclipse anything that I have read in your books. Don't think that I am drawing upon my imagination. The man is alive and constantly under my gaze. *In fact he is my own husband.*" The lady was the wife of Bulwer Lytton!

This may have spurred him on to write *No Name*, appearing in 1862, in order to produce a better villain, and in Captain Wragge and Mrs. Le Count he certainly should have satisfied the most exacting critic. One sees in this volume the same fine literary spirit which characterizes its great predecessor, Dickens even thinking this the finer of the two stories. He had a high opinion of the character of Clare, but cautioned his friend, as he unfolded the tale in *Household Words*, not to tell it too severely. He suggested giving Pendril the lawyer touches of comicality, which, by the way, was not done, though there is a decided accession of humor here over the former novels, fine specimens of which are seen in Clare and Wragge. The latter is strongly suggestive of Montague Tigg in *Martin Chuzzlewit*, and the former is a clever study of the cynic, showing, however, marked traces of the satirical chapter on the Circumlocution Office in *Little Dorrit* which appeared five years before. Have even the best of Dickens's pages anything better

to show than this, where Collins's Clare says: "I have always maintained that the one important phenomenon presented by modern Society is the enormous prosperity of Fools. Show me an individual Fool, and I will show you an aggregate Society which gives that highly favored personage nine chances out of ten—and grudges the tenth to the wisest man in existence. Look where you will, in every high place there sits an Ass, settled beyond the reach of all the greatest intellects in this world to pull him down. Over our whole social system, complacent imbecility rules supreme—snuffs out the searching light of intelligence with total impunity—and hoots, owl-like in answer to every form of protest, 'See how well we all are in the dark!' One of these days that audacious assertion will be practically contradicted, and the whole rotten system of modern society will come down with a crash."

Collins opens *Armsdale*, published in 1866, with the character of Neal, which reminds one somewhat of the lines upon which Clare is drawn. It is in this story that he uses the suggestion of his literary mentor, which he passed over in *No Name*, imparting much Dickensian humor to the two lawyers—father and son—the Pedgrifts.

It was, however, in 1868, with the first issue of *The Moonstone*, that this fascinating author reached the pinnacle of his genius. The critics are undoubtedly right in affirming that this is the greatest thing he ever did. Not only in plot and character drawing does it excel, but the literary arrangement, the delicate touches and transitions in the realms of pathos and humor, entitle the book to a high and enduring place. It is here that one sees, more than anywhere else, the hand of Dickens. In fact, it might well be said that the pupil at this point graduated from his master's school by reason of this admirable piece of art.

One can never forget Mrs. Threadgall, the widow of a deceased Professor of Anatomy, who was constantly talking of her husband as if he were alive, although he had been dead for ten years; nor the good-natured and peppery (all in one) Doctor Canby; Sergeant Cuff with "a face as sharp as a hatchet" and "eye of a steely light-gray"; and Gabriel Betteredge, who

chucks the servant Nancy under the chin "when she looks nice." "It isn't immorality," he says, "it's only habit." These are reminiscent of Mrs. Wilfer, Mrs. Nickleby, Pickwick, Gabriel Varden, Bucket, Perker, Betsy Trotwood, and Wemmick. Then there is Miss Clack, with a Dickens name to begin with; she is Mrs. Jellyby and Miggs rolled into one. And one sees Pecksniff and Chadband in Godfrey Ablewhite.

The value of this work is the more remarkable when the circumstances under which it was written are considered, for it was composed, as was Scott's *Bride of Lammermoor*, under the most distressing physical conditions. Collins had for some years suffered excruciating pain caused by rheumatic gout in the eyes, so greatly, indeed, as to make opium necessary to obtain relief. He says: "I was blind with pain and I lay on the couch writhing and groaning. In that state I dictated the greater part of *The Moonstone*."

Verily, it can well be understood what a boon it was for this tortured man to have the intimacy of the cheery, sympathetic Boz, and it might well be that it was in these moments of suffering that Dickens, out of his enthusiasm for administrative and social reform, as evidenced in *Bleak House*, *Hard Times*, and *Little Dorrit*, turned his friend's mind to the sufferings of others and imparted the influence which brought forth *Heart and Science*, showing the abuses of vivisection; *The New Magdalen*, pointing out the possibility of regenerating fallen woman; and *Man and Wife*, demonstrating the iniquity of the Scotch marriage laws.

Dickens died in 1870 and Collins in 1889, but it is of the living men that the lover of books now thinks. To him this rare and beautiful friendship will ever be alive in the works which both have left behind for the delectation of two worlds.

H. MERIAN ALLEN.

Philadelphia, Pa.

## THE RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Of few subjects is so little really known by the average reader ; on few is there so general a misapprehension as is the case with the exact religious views of the Sage of Monticello. It is often said that Jefferson was an infidel ; he used to be denounced as a blatant atheist. Some enthusiastic Episcopalians claim him for their communion, old Bruton Church, Williamsburg, Virginia, having recently named one of her best pews in his honor. We expect to prove that he was neither atheist nor Episcopalian.

In his own day Jefferson was often spoken of as an infidel. If the word infidel is here taken in its usual meaning, the charge was unjust ; but, if we take the alternate definition of 'infidel'—“one who rejects the doctrines of Christianity usually held in the so-called orthodox churches”—then Jefferson was an infidel. He believed in a God, the creator of all things. In the Declaration of Independence he uses the phrases “endowed by their Creator” and “nature's God”. In the preamble to the act for religious freedom, he uses the language, “whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free”—and “the Holy Author of our religion”. In a letter from France he uses the phrase “overruling Providence”. All through his correspondence, up to his last days, he uses such phrases as “merciful Providence”, “a benevolent Creator”. In letters to his namesakes, he advises them to “adore God”, “murmur not at the ways of Providence”. So far from being an atheist he argues for the existence of an eternal Creator, a Great First Cause, and says that the infidels have always been in a minority of one to a million of believers in God. In a letter to John Adams, dated April 8, 1816, in contrasting the atheist and the theist—these are his own terms—he says that the latter, pointing to the heavens above and to the earth beneath and to the waters under the earth, asked if these did not proclaim a first cause possessing intelligence and power ; power in the production, and intelligence in the design and constant preservation of the system ; he urges the existence of final causes : that the eye was made to see and the ear to hear, and not that we see because we have eyes and hear because we

have ears—an answer, he says, obvious to the senses. This we recognize as the old argument from design used by Socrates and given by Xenophon in his *Memorabilia*, and called by theologians of our day the teleological argument.

Interesting light is thrown upon Jefferson's ideas as to God by his saying in a letter to Mrs. John Adams, dated January 11, 1817: "That God is an essentially benevolent Being is shown by His goodness in stealing away our faculties of enjoyment one by one, searing our sensibilities, until, satiated and fatigued by this ceaseless iteration, we ask our own *congé*."

So much for Jefferson's atheism.

As already said, Jefferson is sometimes claimed by Episcopalians. In one of the encyclopædias we are told that Jefferson was at one time a vestryman. There is a tradition in Charlottesville, Virginia, that he was elected to the vestry of the church in that town shortly after its organization, but there are no records to prove it. If it should prove true that he was a vestryman, this would have very little significance. The canons of the Episcopal church in Virginia on the subject of vestrymen and their qualifications were very lax in Jefferson's day and long after. A man might sit in the vestry and yet hold very erratic views on religious subjects. For instance, when one of the leading Episcopal churches of Richmond, Virginia, was organized, a reputed infidel was elected to its vestry and was afterwards dropped in a congregational uprising. Even now in the diocese of Virginia, that is, the diocese of which Richmond is the "see-city," there are no religious tests applied in the vestry elections, and in Southern Virginia, whose "see-city" is Norfolk, such tests have but recently been adopted. In some dioceses there have been vestrymen holding office quite recently who knew less about "the doctrines, worship and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church" than they did about the Russian Douma.

Even if Jefferson sometimes attended the Episcopal church; even if he sometimes served as a vestryman, he was in his religious views everything but an Episcopalian. And as many of our readers are not Episcopalians, it will be in order to state in detail some of the fundamental doctrines of that church,

especially those which are recited every Sunday in the creeds and formulas.

First: Jesus Christ is "very God of very God, being of one substance with the Father." Jefferson constantly asserts that Christ was not divine and never claimed to be divine; that he was a great philosopher, a great moral teacher, the author of the most perfect system of moral philosophy ever devised by man, greater than Epictetus, Seneca, Socrates, Marcus Aurelius, and other philosophical teachers.

Second: Jesus Christ was "incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary"; that he was born without human generation, so that even in this day of almost unlimited religious toleration, ministers are deposed for denying "the virgin birth" of Christ. On this subject Jefferson says, in a letter to John Adams (April 11, 1823), that *the day will come when the account of the birth of Christ as accepted in the Trinitarian churches will be classed with the fable of Minerva springing from the brain of Jupiter.*

Third: The third day "Christ rose again, according to the scriptures", and on this doctrine of the resurrection she stakes her whole existence. This same doctrine Jefferson utterly rejects, believing that Christ died like any other philosopher—as a man and not as a God. He speaks of Christ frequently in such terms as "this great reformer", "this first of human sages", "the benevolent and sublime reformer of the Jewish religion", "the benevolent moralist", occasionally using the conventional term "our Saviour", but never referring to Christ as the divine Saviour of mankind. He speaks of Him as a great moralist but *immature and undeveloped, and subject to serious limitations as a religious teacher.* The Episcopal church teaches, in her formularies, that Christ is, in eternity, wisdom, power, and omniscience, coequal with the Father and subject to no limitations as a promulgator of moral and religious truth.

Again: the Episcopal Church reads in her services, the "lessons", as she calls them, that it was the Son who created the world. She believes that, while on earth, he performed miracles; that he ascended visibly into heaven in the presence of above five hundred witnesses, the greater part of whom were living when Saint Paul wrote his epistles to the Corinthians; that man

was born a sinner but becomes an heir of salvation by the imputed righteousness of Christ; that the only means of salvation is found in the atoning sacrifice of Christ on the cross; that in baptism men are regenerate and born anew of water and of the Spirit; that "it is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been three orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons"—and that there are three persons in the Godhead but only one God. All these, together with the true and essential divinity of Christ, his miraculous virgin birth by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, his resurrection, his appearance among his apostles for forty days, and his ascension into heaven, are clearly set forth in the creeds and in the Thirty-nine Articles. Let us see how many of these doctrines were held by Jefferson.

In a letter to William Short, dated October 31, 1817, Jefferson, speaking of "artificial systems invented by ultra-Christian sects", "doctrines added to the teachings of Christ without any authority from Him", names the following: "the immaculate conception [of Christ], his deification, the creation of the world by him, his miraculous powers, his resurrection and visible ascension, his corporeal presence in the eucharist, the Trinity, original sin, atonement, regeneration, election, orders of hierarchy." What is left to believe in? Let us take up the foregoing clauses in detail.

Of Jefferson's view of the miraculous birth of Christ we have already spoken, quoting the startling comparison with the myth of Minerva. As to the deification of Christ, Jefferson says he never claimed to be divine. In a letter to Benjamin Rush, dated April 31, 1803, he says: "I am a Christian in the only sense in which he wished anyone to be; sincerely attached to his doctrines in preference to all others; ascribing to himself every human excellence; and believing he never claimed any other."

As said already, he regarded Christ as the greatest of moral philosophers. In a letter dated April 19, 1803, he characterized "the moral precepts of Jesus" as more pure, correct, and sublime than those of the ancient philosophers. "They extended their cares scarcely beyond our kindred and friends individually

and our country in the abstract. Jesus embraced, with charity and philanthropy, our neighbors, our countrymen, and the whole family of mankind."

Is this the language of an Episcopalian? Can the writer of such sentences recite the creeds, and end his prayers with the phrase "through Jesus Christ our Lord"? Can he stand up and say, "I believe in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, Begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten not made"?

Coming to the Trinity. The Episcopal church has always been Trinitarian. One of her high festivals is Trinity Sunday. Her longest season is the Trinity season, numbering nearly half her Sundays with reference to their time "after Trinity". In the prayers and litanies, she calls upon Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as coequal in dignity and in power. She teaches her children to believe in "God the Father, who made me and all the world"; in "God the Son, who redeemed me and all mankind"; and in "God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all the people of God". Let us see whether Jefferson could possibly stand up in a pew and use such language.

In a letter (November 4, 1820) to Jared Sparks, he says: "The religion of Jesus is founded on the unity of God, and this principle chiefly gave it triumph over the rabble of heathen gods then acknowledged." In a letter of February 27, 1821, to Timothy Pickering, he characterizes the doctrine of the Trinity as "the *incomparable jargon* of the Trinitarian arithmetic that three are one and one is three." In a letter of December 8, 1822, he says: "The hocus-pocus phantasm of a God *like another Cerberus*, with one body and three heads, had its birth and growth in the blood of thousands and thousands of martyrs."

A special object of Jefferson's abomination is Athanasius, the leader of the Trinitarians in the council of Nicæa. The "fanatic Athanasius", he excoriates in many of his letters. "The impious dogmatists as Athanasius and Calvin", he writes to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, June 26, 1822.

Another object of his virulence is the Apostle Paul, so dear to every Christian believer. Him he denounces as the *chief corrupter of the doctrines of Christ*.

Almost the only doctrine of the Episcopal Church held by Jefferson was a belief in "God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth."

Certainly no Episcopalian can afford to claim him as a fellow-Churchman.

Next, Jefferson is often claimed by the Unitarians. Let us see what they believe.

The foremost Unitarian of Jefferson's day was the Reverend William Ellery Channing. His sermons contain an epitome of the Unitarian doctrine. He speaks continually of "one God", the "Universal Parent", the "Universal Father", "one Supreme God", indivisible. So far his teachings run parallel with the opinions of Jefferson.

Christ, says Dr. Channing, is the "greatest of the sons of God", but not God. He *works miracles*, but nowhere claims to be divine. "Trinity" is a man-made doctrine, without any warrant in scripture. Christ is "the conqueror of death", "the heir of immortality", "the *divine messenger*", gone before us into heaven. He always speaks of Christ in terms of reverence, of love, and of worship, yielding Him all honor and glory, but not admitting that He is a member of the Godhead.

Of the Apostle Paul, Channing speaks frequently and reverently, quoting him as an inspired teacher.

Dr. Channing believes firmly in *miracles* and in immortality, emphasizing the resurrection of Christ. The whole Bible he regards as God's revelation to man. He believes firmly in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and accepts the Bible account of the miracles wrought by Christ and his apostles.

Dr. Channing and other prominent Unitarians believe in the utter sincerity of the apostles and the other sacred writers. No slur against Saint Paul or any other apostle ever passes their lips. The daily companions of Christ, together with St. Paul himself, are treated with the respect and awe usually rendered them by all Christian bodies.

Let us compare Jefferson's opinions with those outlined above.

That he denounces Saint Paul as the chief corrupter of the doctrines of Christ, we have seen already.

Jefferson does not believe in miracles, in inspiration, in revela-

tion. He regards the apostles not only as not infallible but as ignorant and fallible men, liable to serious error. "The teachings of Christ," says he, "have come down to us mutilated, misstated, and often unintelligible." The apostles and evangelists make the most puerile and erroneous statements as to Christ and his work. They wrote from memory long after they had heard Him declare His doctrines; much was forgotten, much misunderstood, much presented in very paradoxical form.

Everything miraculous is rejected. All the parts of the Bible in which miracles are recounted were written by enthusiasts, *dupes*, and *impostors*, who added to the record things which Christ never said or dreamed of.

If Dr. Channing was a Unitarian, what was Jefferson?

We say without hesitation that he was neither Atheist, nor Episcopalian, nor Unitarian. Let us see whether any sect or party may claim him.

He believed in one God, undivided, indivisible. He believed in religion, but despised sectarianism, ministers, ecclesiasts, and ecclesiasticism. "Reason is our only guide." He believed that the ministers of religion, the "priests", as he called them, were principally concerned with "the loaves and fishes". The Bible, as used in the churches, was a tissue of impostures devised for the subjugation of the human mind and for priestly aggrandizement. A new Bible, purged of all superhuman elements, is sorely needed, and he urges some friends to edit such a volume.

The above paragraph, together with his hatred of Saint Paul, puts him very near the Deists. Who will venture to classify him with any Christian body?

"I am a real Christian," says he,— "that is to say, a disciple of the doctrine of Jesus, very different from the Platonists, who call *me* infidel and themselves Christians and preachers of the gospel, while they draw all their characteristic dogmas from what its author never said nor saw."

Some people of his day thought that Jefferson was a Socinian: he claimed to be a Unitarian. That he did great harm among the young men of Virginia, we may say upon very high authority of his own day.

Professor George Tucker, one of Jefferson's biographers, says that he claimed to be a Unitarian, but that his creed was "nearer to the Socinian than to any other, though it could not perhaps be classed with any particular sect." Jefferson sometimes uses the terms 'Unitarianism' and 'primitive Christianity' as synonymous. He was especially fond of Dr. Joseph Priestley, the eminent Unitarian scientist and theologian. While living in Philadelphia he attended Unitarian services. In a letter to Dr. Benjamin Waterhouse, he expresses the hope that every young man in the United States will die a Unitarian. In another letter to Dr. Waterhouse, he says: "I am anxious to see the doctrine of one god commenced in our state. . . . I must be contented to be an Unitarian by myself, although I know there are many around me who would become so if they could hear the question fairly stated."

If 'Unitarian' means 'anti-Trinitarian', we might accept Jefferson's classification of his opinions. His bitterness against Athanasius and his comparison of the Trinity to the mythological Cerberus, make him the arch-champion of the anti-Trinitarian but do not bring him near the Unitarians of America.

Jefferson speaks also of "the *weakness* of Jesus." "The doctrines which he really delivered were *defective* as a whole." "It is not to be understood that I am with him in all his doctrines." "Christ," he goes on to say, "fought his enemies with their own weakness: evasion, *subterfuge* and *cunning*." If this is shocking, prepare for something worse yet from this alleged vestryman and canonized churchman. In a letter to William Short, he says: "There are, I acknowledge, passages not free from objection which we may with probability ascribe to Jesus himself; but claiming indulgence from the circumstances under which he acted. . . . The office of reformer of the superstitions of a nation is ever dangerous. Jesus had to walk over the perilous confines of reason and religion; and a step to right or left might place him within the grasp of the priests of the superstitions, a blood-thirsty race, as cruel and remorseless as the being whom they represented as the God of Israel. They were constantly laying snares, too, to entangle him in the web of the law. He was justifiable, therefore, in

avoiding these by evasion, by *sophisms*, by misconstructions and misapprehensions of scraps of the prophets, and in defending himself with these their own weapons, as sufficient, *ad homines*, at least." In another place, he says that Christ held out eternal life as a prize for good behavior, and intimates that Christ thus displayed great adroitness and worldly wisdom.

In what catechism or "confession" is such a view of Christ given? What Christian body will vote Jefferson a tablet in its church?

We have already placed Jefferson near the Deists or Free-thinkers. Lord Herbert of Cherbury, called "the Father of Deism", declared that the five divinely-planted, original, indefensible concepts of the human mind are: (1) There is one Supreme God; (2) He is to be worshiped; (3) worship consists chiefly of virtue and piety; (4) we must repent of our sins and cease from them; (5) there are rewards and punishments here and hereafter. Woolston, one of the principal Deists of England, by his *bitter invectives against the clergy*, against all priesthood and priesthood, added a new feature to deistic literature (1669-1731). Blount, another prominent deist, instituted a comparison between the miracles of Apollonius of Tyana and those of Christ. He assaulted the doctrine of a mediator as irreligious, and joined Herbert in the view that many of the errors in religion or most of them have been invented by sagacious men in the interest of themselves and their own class, and for the purpose of holding down the ignorant masses. This bitter view is upheld by Bolingbroke (1678-1751), another prominent deist. All these writers taught that religion was a faithful following of the eternal laws of morality; that men should adore the Creator, avoiding all factitious forms of worship as worse than useless. They rejected the miraculous; rejected the doctrine of the Trinity; protested against mediatorship, the atonement, and the imputed righteousness of Christ, emphasizing the teaching of Christ but minimizing the teaching of the church about Him. One special *object of their scorn was the Apostle Paul*, as we are explicitly told by a high authority. All this brings Jefferson pretty close to the school of Voltaire, Bolingbroke, Shaftesbury, and Thomas Paine, the Deists, or

Freethinkers, predecessors of the German rationalists: he was, in many respects, what is called "an immortal Deist", though he had really no consistent opinions in religious matters.

Jefferson believed in a heaven, as a reward for those who had followed the light of conscience. In a letter to his friend Miles King, he says: "Following the guidance of a good conscience, let us be happy in the hope that by these different paths we shall all meet in the end. And that you and I may there meet and embrace is my earnest prayer." To another friend he writes: "The term is not very distant at which we are to deposit in the same cerement our own errors and suffering bodies, and to ascend in essence to an extatic [sic] meeting with the friends we have loved and lost, and whom we shall love still and never lose again." His last words were, "I now resign my soul, without fear, to my God; my daughter, to my country."

Jefferson was undoubtedly not devoid of religious sensibilities; but his views were totally undigested, lacking in order and in consistency.

The foregoing conclusions we reached some time ago after a careful study of the writings of Jefferson. Recently we submitted a synopsis of his views to two prominent theologians without giving the name of the person holding these opinions. One of these scholars said that this man was totally ignorant on the whole subject of religion; that his views could not be classified and were entirely unworthy of serious consideration. The other said pretty much the same thing but added that he might possibly be classified as a "rationalistic Unitarian."

Jefferson declares himself a believer in the materialistic view of the soul. "Mr. Locke," he says, "openly maintained the materialism of the soul. . . . The fathers of the church of the three first centuries, if not universally, were materialists, extending even to the Creator himself; nor indeed do I know exactly in what age of the Christian church the heresy of spiritualism [sic] was introduced." Writing to John Adams he says: "To talk of immaterial existences is to talk of *nothings*. To say that the human soul, angels, God, are immaterial is to say they are *nothings*, or that there is no God, no angels, no soul. I cannot reason otherwise. . . . At what age of the Christian church this

heresy of immaterialism, or masked atheism, crept in, I do not know. But a heresy it certainly is. Jesus taught nothing of it. He told us, indeed, that 'God is a spirit,' but he has not defined what a spirit is, nor said that it is not *matter*. And the ancient fathers of the three first centuries held it to be matter, light and thin indeed, an ethereal gas, but still matter."

Jefferson believed in natural religion and rejected inspiration and revelation. "Reason is our only guide." "We are accountable to God alone for our religious views." The apostles, he says, made the most puerile and erroneous statements as to Jesus and his work. Shortly after His death, His followers corrupted His pure moral precepts into an engine for enslaving mankind and aggrandizing priesthooood and priestcraft. His system of morals, though the purest ever given to man, was adulterated and sophisticated into a mere contrivance to *filch wealth and power to themselves*, denouncing as infidels all who were not able to swallow their impious heresies. The teachings of Christ have come down to us mutilated, misstated, and often unintelligible."

"Jefferson's Bible" is one of the "Curiosities of Literature." This book, called by him *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth*, was published by Congress in the year 1904. From the four evangelists he selects those passages which describe the merely human side of Christ's life and give his "sublime moral doctrines." All references to his miraculous birth, the testimony of responsible witnesses to his miracles and to the supernatural side of his life, are scrupulously omitted. For instance, in Luke I, he gives verses 1-7, inclusive, describing the human aspect of the birth of Christ, but omits verses 8-20, in which the angels announce to the shepherds that "this day there is born in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." Verse 21 of the same chapter he cuts in half, omitting the part which tells that the child Jesus was named "before he was conceived in the womb." In the same chapter he omits verses 22-38, no doubt because they contain the recognition of the infant as the "Lord's Christ" by Simeon and Anna. This omitted passage contains the *Nunc Dimittis*, one of the gems of the Christian liturgies. Shall we infer that this was a part of the

twaddle and nonsense injected into the record by fanatics, imbeciles, and *impostors*, to further their schemes of imposture, chicanery, and "*roguery*"?

The record of the crucifixion he edits in the same manner. In John 19, he quotes circumstantially the ordinary, natural events of the crucifixion but omits the passage in which the apostle, sixty years after the event, says in substance: "I saw these things with my own eyes. . . . The soldiers, in not breaking His bones and in piercing His side fulfilled predictions of the ancient prophets of Israel." He cuts out also the passages in which heathen soldiers cried out, "Truly this man was the son of God."

Is this fair? Is this ingenuous? Is this the kind of criticism that Jefferson applied to political papers and documents? If the fanatics, enthusiasts, and misguided simpletons can be trusted in forty verses of a chapter, why is their testimony in regard to three verses to be rejected?

After all, is Jefferson's opinion on religious subjects worth reckoning with? Is his opinion worthy of serious considerations? Let us see whether he devoted much of his time to religious matters; whether he even really "searched the scriptures" half as earnestly as thousands of our readers do.

At the age of fifty-eight, in writing to the Reverend Isaac Story he says: "When a young man, I indulged in speculations as to the future life, but *for many years I have ceased to read or to think concerning them.*" Writing to a friend June 11, 1825, he says: "Mine has been too much a life of action to allow my mind to wander from the occurrences pressing on it." In 1819, in a letter to the Reverend Ezra Stiles, acknowledging a copy of a work on metaphysics, he says that he has been too busy all his life to devote much thought to such branches of study. In short, he devoted less time to the great problems of religion than to any one great problem of politics. He was a mere amateur, a mere dabbler in religion. His opinions on religious subjects are worth no more than the writer's opinions as to conducting a spool-cotton factory. Why should young men be influenced by his crass views on religious subjects?

We shall close with extracts from "A Profession of Faith",

penned by a famous man of the Revolutionary era. It is typical of that "age of reason"; it sounds like a résumé of opinions outlined above:—

"I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life.

"I believe in the equality of man, and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow-workers happy.

"I do not believe in the creed professed by the Jewish church, by the Roman church, by the Greek church, by the Turkish church, by the Protestant church, nor by any church that I know of. My own mind is my own church.

"All national institutions of churches, whether Jewish, Christian, or Turkish, appear to me no other than human inventions set up to terrify and enslave mankind, and monopolize power and profit.

"[He] takes up the trade of priest for the sake of gain, and, in order to qualify himself for that trade, he begins with a perjury."

This might have been written by Jefferson, but was written by Thomas Paine.

J. LESSLIE HALL.

William and Mary College, Virginia.

## JOHN LOCKE'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

This paper aims to call attention to a new interpretation of John Locke's views on education, by emphasizing the fact that his educational writings, like his philosophical contributions, characterize him essentially as a pioneer in certain aspects in this field of work. The following points will be discussed successively: His life and education; his position as a philosopher, psychologist, and educator; his emphasis on "native propensities" and periods of child development; his opposition to formal discipline; and his views on the relation of teacher and pupil, the dynamic side of child life, and the aim of discipline.

In order to understand Locke, it is necessary to realize that his aims and methods were largely determined by the place and time in which he lived and by the schools which he attended. His early life was spent at home in the country, where he was taught by his father; this fact explains in part why he favored the tutorial form of education. The old stone farmhouse at Pennsford, Somersetshire, where he lived from 1632 to 1646, may still be visited. The older section of the house is rapidly going to decay and when the writer made inquiries regarding its location,—from a blacksmith who has lived for ten years within a stone's throw of the old homestead,—the reply was, "I do not know the gentleman," and, when informed that Locke died nearly three hundred years ago, the answer varied little,—"I never 'erd of the gentleman." Fortunately, however, conditions are quite different at Westminster School and at Christ Church College, where are found paintings, statues, coats-of-arms, and memorial windows in honor of the "pious John Locke", who is considered their "most famous student."

At fourteen Locke entered Westminster School in London, where he was associated with Dryden, South, and the renowned Dr. Buzby, the headmaster. Dr. Buzby 'taught his school' across the street from Westminster Hall during a large part of the reign of Charles I, the Commonwealth period, the reign of Charles II, James II, and nine years of the reign of William and Mary, being headmaster of the school for fifty-seven years. He

it was who said, "The rod is my sieve and the boy who cannot pass through, is no boy for me."<sup>1</sup> This also was the master who refused to take off his hat when the king visited the school, for fear the boys might think there was a greater man in the kingdom than Richard Buzby,—the great schoolmaster who 'kept his school' in spite of a revolution, the execution of his king, "the threatenings of a great fire and the ravages of a cruel plague"; a stern teacher, respected but always disliked by his sensitive pupil, who ever after denounced many of his methods.

It is held by many authorities that Locke was among the schoolboys who saw the execution of Charles I in front of Whitehall. Of this we are not sure, but we know that his father was a colonel in the Parliamentary army; that his life was spent in a period of civil and religious fermentation in England; and that the rigid discipline and confining life of the school affected his delicate health and sensitive nature so that he ever after opposed<sup>2</sup> the so-called Public Schools of his time, and subsequently aided in modifying their methods of teaching and discipline.

When Locke left Westminster and entered Oxford, he found he was not in sympathy with the predominant classical course of study or the prevailing methods of instruction. He continued his study for several years, however, and received the degrees of A.B., A.M., and M.D.; later he was expelled. The order from Charles II, dated Whitehall, 11th day of November, 1684, may be seen in the library of Christ Church College. It is signed by the Earl of Sunderland, and reads:—

"Whereas we have received information of the factious and disloyal behavior of . . . Locke, one of the students of that college, we have thought fit to signify our will and pleasure to you, that you forthwith remove him from his said student's place and deprive him of all the rights and advantages thereto belonging."

Locke then began to travel, and his long period of preparation culminated in productive literary work after he was fifty-seven

---

<sup>1</sup> The Deanery Guide to Westminster Abbey, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Some Thoughts Concerning Education (Quick Ed.), pp. 74, 138, 150-3.

years of age. He died at Oates, in 1704, at the age of seventy-two.

It is known that Locke read with care the educational writings of Montaigne, but that he was practically unacquainted with Ascham, Mulcaster, Ratich, or Commenius, and had paid little attention to the great writers of Greece and Rome. His work was, in the main, the result of his own observations and reflections, for Locke was a pioneer,—a pioneer in philosophy, in that he founded the predominating empiricism of England, and, as has frequently been pointed out, laid the foundation for the idealism of Berkeley, the skepticism of Hume, the sensationalism of Condillac, and the criticism of Kant; a pioneer in psychology, in that he destroyed the faculty psychology of Aristotle and established on a substantial basis the introspective method of to-day; a pioneer in education, in that he opposed the scholastic method and harsh discipline of the schools, favored an all-round, wholesome, common-sense education, and paved the way for modern child-psychology. His educational writings also served as a corrective to the bias of his time by laying emphasis on the sympathetic relationship between the teacher and pupil and on the dynamic side of child life.

In Locke's writings on education, psychology, and philosophy we find him preëminently critical and a true example of the practical Englishman, dealing vigorously, directly, and carefully with whatever object he wishes to analyze, but still positive rather than negative in his conclusions. The English philosophers confined themselves to the study of the human mind and society from an empirical point of view. Locke was a typical English philosopher. He was prosaic and practical, treating his problems in a common-sense manner; he analyzed rather than synthesized,—described rather than explained. His chief mental virtues were sincerity and simplicity, and he was so devoted to the truth that on one occasion he declared, "Whatever I write, as soon as I discover it not to be true, my hand shall be the forwardest to throw it into the fire."

The object, or purpose, of Locke's inquiries was to study the nature of his own mind, to determine the power of the individual and to destroy the scholastic method. His *Essay Con-*

*cerning the Human Understanding*, he asserts, is a copy of his own mind, and his method the plain "historical",<sup>3</sup> or as we would speak of it, the psychological method. Professor R. B. Perry of Harvard<sup>4</sup> has shown, however, that he blends and frequently confuses the logical, epistemological, and psychological view-points.

Locke destroyed the Aristotelian "faculty psychology", established the introspective method, and, with Descartes, laid the foundation of modern rationalistic psychology, thus shifting the basis for educational theory. Professor James, his greatest disciple, goes so far as to maintain that there has been little new psychology since Locke; although it has progressed wonderfully in refining its methods of study and in broadening its scope!<sup>5</sup>

In attempting to combat Descartes' theory of innate ideas, Locke apparently takes the opposite extreme in his philosophy and holds that knowledge is entirely the product of experience, for the mind at birth is an "empty tablet".<sup>6</sup> Descartes never gave a very clear definition of "innate ideas", but Locke regarded the idea as an object of consciousness, or, as he states it, "Whatsoever is the object of the understanding when a man thinks."<sup>7</sup> In his philosophical writings he emphasizes the external evocation of the idea; that is, the relation of ideas to the objects from which they have arisen, the epistemological point of view. In his educational writings, on the other hand, he is continually referring to native tendencies to action. Thus his educational theory, contrary to what his interpreters have been emphasizing, takes into consideration the fact that there are "natural tendencies implanted in the minds of men."<sup>8</sup>

This may be illustrated by a number of quotations, but the following will give his general point of view. When speaking of the education of children, Locke, as an educator, says:—

"We must not hope wholly to change their original tempers. . . . God has stamped certain characters upon men's

<sup>3</sup> *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (Bohn Ed.), p. 129.

<sup>4</sup> *The Approach to Philosophy*, p. 273.

<sup>5</sup> *Talks to Teachers*, p. 7.

<sup>6</sup> *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Bk. I.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* p. 134.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.* p. 158.

minds, which, like their shapes, may perhaps be a little mended, but can hardly be totally altered and transformed into the contrary”;

and further,—

“He, therefore, that is about children should well study their natures and aptitudes, and see by often trials what turns they easily take and what becomes them”;

and further,—

“For in many cases all we can do or should aim at, is to make the best of what nature has given, to prevent the vices and faults to which such a constitution is most inclined, and give it all the advantages it is capable of. Every one's natural genius should be carried as far as it could, but to attempt the putting another upon him will be but labor in vain, and what is so plastered on will at best sit untowardly, and have always hanging to it the ungracefulness of constraint and affectation.”<sup>9</sup>

“Native propensities,”<sup>10</sup> he says, ‘should be watched from the beginning, in order to discover the individual's capacity for knowledge,’ for “amongst men of equal education there are great inequalities of parts.”<sup>11</sup> These quotations indicate that Locke does not tack education on to life as is commonly asserted, but makes it dependent on the interest, disposition, temperament, and the development of the individual from within.

It further becomes apparent from many of his scattered but valuable thoughts on the observation of children, and his suggestions tending toward a study of mental development and self-activity, that there originated with Locke a psychological tendency in education, which was later to be developed by Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Herbart, evolving into the present predominating psychological and biological view-points in education, of which the child is the centre of orientation. Locke advocated that parents and tutors should “study children's natures and aptitudes”,<sup>12</sup> “their native propensities”,<sup>13</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Some Thoughts Concerning Education, p. 40.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. p. 83.

<sup>11</sup> On the Conduct of the Understanding (Bohn Ed.), p. 26.

<sup>12</sup> Some Thoughts Concerning Education, p. 40.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. p. 83.

"their prevailing inclinations",<sup>14</sup> "their several conditions", because acquired habits may be conditioned by these native propensities. A study of mental development, though crude and inaccurate, is suggested by this and by what follows, for he writes:—

"Never trouble yourselves about those faults in them [children] which you know age will cure";<sup>15</sup>

and again,—

"And if you carefully observe the characters of his [the child's] mind, now in the first scenes of his life, you will ever after be able to judge which way his thoughts lean, and what he aims at even hereafter, when, as he grows up, the plot thickens and he puts on several shapes to act it."<sup>16</sup>

This writer perhaps knew nothing of instincts, but he said, to quote indirectly, 'Observe carefully for favorable seasons of aptitude and inclination'<sup>17</sup> and 'teach the child when he is in tune.'<sup>18</sup> This is similar to Professor James's advice to "Strike the iron while it is hot", and to the present-day educational vernacular to "appeal to the instincts when they are ripe."

Habit, it is true, is continually emphasized by Locke and it is on this account that Professor Paul Monroe in his *History of Education* has excluded him from the usual classification as a naturalist, a realist, or a humanist and posited him as a typical representative of the disciplinary education. Monroe emphatically states:—

"The one fundamental thing that makes Locke a representative of the disciplinary education throughout is his idea of the human mind as a blank to begin with, that it has virtues and powers worked into it from the outside through its formation of habits. In respect to many other important points, as will be seen, Locke agrees with the naturalists who, opposing Locke on this point, held that all such powers came as the development of powers within, according to a wholly natural process. Development, according to Locke, came only through the formation of habit through discipline."<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Some Thoughts Concerning Education, p. 83.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. p. 43.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. p. 83.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. p. 53.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. p. 53.

<sup>19</sup> Text Book in the History of Education, p. 513.

Professor Monroe does not give credit for Locke's emphasis on the development of the "different temperaments", "natural aptitudes", and "natural inclinations" of the pupil, and does not recognize the fact that 'habits' are always limited in their application to education and character. Locke was not speaking of habit in general but of particular habits. It is hardly fair to try to posit him as a typical representative of the "Disciplinary Education" of his period, for Professor Monroe defines this disciplinary education, of which he makes Locke the chief exponent, as follows:—

"A particular activity of experience, especially of an intellectual character, if well selected, produces a power or ability out of all proportion to the expenditure of energy therein; a power that will be serviceable in most dissimilar experiences or activities, that will be available in every situation, that will be applicable to the solution of problems presented by any subject, however remote in kind from the one furnishing the occasion for the original disciplinary experience."<sup>20</sup>

It seems highly improbable that Locke ever held this view. Although he once said that mathematics should be taught all in order to make them (children) reasonable creatures,<sup>21</sup> he approached modern psychological insight into the study of the transference of mental ability when he said:—

"But the learning pages of Latin by heart no more fits the memory for retention of anything else, than the graving of one sentence in lead makes it the more capable of retaining any other characters."<sup>22</sup>

He further states,—

"If men are for a long time accustomed only to one sort or method of thoughts, their minds grow stiff in it, and do not readily turn to another. It is, therefore, to give them this freedom, that I think they should be made to look into all sorts of knowledge, and exercise their understanding in so wide a variety and stock of knowledge. But I do not

---

<sup>20</sup> Text Book in the History of Education, p. 508.

<sup>21</sup> On the Conduct of the Understanding, p. 41.

<sup>22</sup> Some Thoughts Concerning Education, p. 154.

propose it as a variety and stock of knowledge, but a variety and freedom of thinking, as an increase of the powers and activity of the mind, not as an enlargement of its possessions."<sup>33</sup>

It is also apparent that Professor James's view of native retentiveness in memory, which has so far successfully withstood so many attacks, was anticipated by Locke when he said :—

"But I fear this faculty of the mind [memory] is not capable of much help and amendment in general by any exercise or endeavor of ours, at least not by that used upon this pretence in Grammar Schools."<sup>34</sup>\*

Locke goes further and anticipates what we might consider the distinctly American point of view in regard to the relation between teacher and pupil. His advice here is excellent and its significance in England is to-day keenly realized. The essential attitude of parent and teacher is not only that of a critic and disciplinarian, but, also underneath it all, that of a friend :—

"But whatever he [the child] consults you about, unless it lead to some fatal irremediable mischief, be sure you advise only as a friend of more experience, but with your advice mingle nothing of command and authority, nor more than you would to your equal or a stranger."<sup>35</sup>

Seek the children's friendship, for all young people are glad of sure friends, he implies.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> On the Conduct of the Understanding, p. 44.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. p. 154.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid. p. 79.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid. p. 80.

\* Since this article was accepted for publication by the *Sewanee Review*, my attention has been called to a doctor's dissertation by Frederick Arthur Hodge on "John Locke and Formal Discipline." (Published by the author, Winthrop Normal and Industrial College, S. C.) Dr. Hodge's point of view is similar to that outlined in this article, and I hasten to insert his conclusions in the proof-sheet. He says :—

"That the evidence adduced tends to show : First, that Locke's philosophy and psychology furnish no basis for the dogma in question. Second, that he sought to set aside the limited curriculum based upon the disciplinary conception of his time, and substitute for it a broader curriculum. Third, that he urged the abolition of abstract rules and generalizations in favor of concrete specific experiences. Fourth, that Locke's various references to education as a discipline may best be interpreted in the light of *specific disciplines* and *concepts of method*, and such interpretation is consistent with his philosophy."

Locke's *Thoughts Concerning Education* had gone through three editions between 1693-5 and it must have helped to arouse public opinion, for in 1698 an Act was asked for in Parliament "to remedy the foul abuse of children at schools, especially in the great schools of the nation."<sup>27</sup> This Act was not passed, and Locke's influence was long delayed in its effect. Over a century and a half later Spencer said, "The discipline in these schools is worse than that of adult life—much more unjust, cruel, brutal."<sup>28</sup> He then calls attention with approval to Locke's statement, "Great severity of punishment does but little good, nay, great harm, in education, and I believe it will be found that, *ceteris paribus*, those children who have been most chastised seldom make the best men."<sup>29</sup>

The dynamic side of child life was frequently emphasized by Locke and has occupied a very prominent place in the best educational writings of the past few years. "Children are naturally active and less apt to be idle than men,"<sup>30</sup> said our philosopher, who had caught indirectly the spirit of Plato and had anticipated Froebel, when he wrote to his friend, William Molyneus, August 23, 1693:—

"I am so much for recreation that I would, as much as possible, have all they [children] do be made so; I am for full liberty of diversion as much as you can be, and, upon a second perusal of my book, I do not doubt you will find me so."<sup>31</sup>

In the book which has been interpreted as advocating the form of rigid disciplinary educational point of view of the seventeenth century, Locke writes that children enjoy play,—

"And it is that liberty alone, which gives the true relish and delight to their ordinary play game";<sup>32</sup>

and again,—

"I have always had a fancy that learning might be made a play and recreation to children",<sup>33</sup>

<sup>27</sup> W. C. Hazlitt, *Schools, School-books and School-masters*, p. 25.

<sup>28</sup> *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, p. 179.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.* p. 219.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* p. 132.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 12th ed., Eng., 1854, Vol. VIII, p. 323.

<sup>32</sup> *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, p. 55.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.* p. 129.

and, therefore, we should smooth their (children's) way and help them readily forward.<sup>34</sup> There should be directed play,<sup>35</sup> and—

"The chief art [of the educator] is to make all that they [children] have to do sport and play, too."<sup>36</sup>

These passages show that Locke opposes the educational bias of his time, as is also clear from the following definite statement:—

"Children love liberty, and therefore they should be brought to do the things that are fit for them without feeling any restraint laid upon them."<sup>37</sup> "That which parents should take care of here is to distinguish between the wants of fancy and those of nature";<sup>38</sup> "Children should not have anything like work or serious[ness] laid upon them; neither their minds nor bodies will bear it."<sup>39</sup>

To be sure, these are more or less isolated quotations, but is this typical of the disciplinary education of the seventeenth century?

The *Thoughts Concerning Education* is full of stimulating ideas on the ultimate aim of education, methods of teaching, personal hygiene, the aims of good discipline, the kinds, uses, and limitations of punishments, and on trenchant criticisms of the educational practices of the time in which Locke lived, especially in his emphasis on a "sound mind in a sound body." His aims in discipline are so good, and his view-point so clear, that two short quotations will be adequate to explain his theory:—

"He that has found a way how to keep up a child's spirit easy, active, and free, and yet at the same time to restrain him from many things he has a mind to, and to draw him to things that are uneasy to him; he, I say, that knows how to reconcile these seeming contradictions, has, in my opinion, got the true secret of education."<sup>40</sup>

Patterns are to be followed more than good rules, for children do much by imitation, since,—

"We are all a sort of chameleons that still take a tincture from things near us."<sup>41</sup>

<sup>34</sup> *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, p. 132.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.* p. 38.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.* p. 130.

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.* p. 83.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.* p. 30.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.* p. 84.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.* p. 44.

Though Locke's educational writings have been neglected by many educators, Leibnitz considered the *Thoughts* superior to the *Essays*,<sup>42</sup> and Horace Mann said as early as 1850, when discussing important sources in education, "It would be unpardonable to pass by that admirable treatise, Locke's *Thoughts on Education*. . . . This excellent treatise, which is by far better than anything which had ever been written, has been almost wholly neglected and forgotten."<sup>43</sup>

Space will not permit at this time a review of the numerous mistakes and omissions in Locke's educational work, but suffice it to mention that in his comprehensive course of study in which he advances modern ideas on object teaching, manual training, trade schools, and school gardening, he neglects the cultural subjects of art and music.

Sources in educational tendencies are interesting and instructive, and for a study of the beginning of modern ideas in education, one cannot find a more fertile field than the writings of John Locke; the pioneer who built better than he knew, but whose merits lay in conceiving rather than in carrying to completion the conceptions which he formulated. He was not a teacher, though his educational writings are preëminently practical; his influence was most marked in directing the line of thought of the great writers who followed him and in shaping popular opinion, rather than in helping the schoolmen of his period. He was a pioneer who cleared the field in order that others might cultivate.

BIRD T. BALDWIN.

Swarthmore College.

---

<sup>42</sup> Cited by Compayre, *History of Pedagogy* (Payne Ed.), p. 196.

<sup>43</sup> *Life and Works of Horace Mann*, Mary Mann, II, p. 225.

## THE CIVIL WAR AS A UNIFIER

In these days of Civil War anniversaries and celebrations, memory constantly turns back fifty years to the stupendous conflict that preserved our existence as a nation. Yet with all our pride in the achievements of that heroic struggle we Americans generally overlook its true significance. Other struggles have been rendered glorious by daring charges upon the ramparts of the foe; other armies have inscribed on their banners victories as brilliant as Chancellorsville or Gettysburg; other crises have developed leaders whom whole nations have delighted to honor. What is peculiar to the American Civil War is the generous feeling of reconciliation, the spirit of nationality, which has developed since the close of hostilities.

In this connection we too often forget the conditions in our early history as an independent government. When the Constitution was adopted, there was virtually no consciousness of national unity. The colonies, widely separated and dependent for communication on slow oxen and lumbering coaches, were naturally far more sensible of their individual needs and importance than of any common aims and aspirations. The War of 1812 was the first event in our national existence to arouse a feeling of unity among the separate commonwealths. But it is significant of the state of public opinion in 1814 that, before the treaty of peace was signed, a New England convention met in Hartford to safeguard the privileges of the states against the alleged encroachments of the federal government.

In the succeeding two decades the commonwealths carved from the Northwest Territory were filled with a vigorous, self-reliant democracy, which demanded that popular majorities should become the ruling power in government, and with the election of Jackson in 1828 put that demand into effect. During the '30's and '40's the increased use of steam in transportation on land and water, the diversification of manufactures resulting from numerous inventions, the swiftly growing forces of industry and commerce, consolidated this democracy, brought forward conspicuously the common interests of the republic as

a whole, and produced a new organic consciousness and singleness of purpose.

This consciousness remained vague and general until it received magnificent expression in the speeches of Daniel Webster. Joseph Story's *Commentaries on the Constitution* presented to lawyers, indeed, a lucid and logical argument for the theory that the central government is supreme, but it was Webster's reply to Hayne and his debate with Calhoun that clothed with eloquence the conviction of the North and West that the United States, bound in indivisible union, had become a mighty nation, the sovereign power in an empire, which could appeal to the allegiance of every individual within its bounds. When declaimed by thousands of schoolboys during the thirty years that intervened before the opening of the Civil War, his words aroused in the heart of the maturing democracy an ever deeper devotion to the Union.

From this sense of nationality the South was largely shut out by its peculiar institution. It remained a strictly agricultural section. Streams of commerce flowed but sluggishly through its territory. It retained the notions and customs of the Revolutionary era while the Western democracy was coming into control of the machinery of national government, and it was because this young democracy was antagonistic to what the Southern aristocracy regarded as its interests and its future that the differences were submitted to the arbitrament of the sword.

To say that the war confirmed the sentiment of disunion is a superficial judgment. On the contrary, the war deepened and spread the sense of nationality until we have become one people in fact as well as in name. The citizen of Maine or Michigan was not defending the soil of his native state, but fighting for the flag of the Union. The Georgia youth who toiled through the Seven Days Battles before Richmond was not protecting his home, but battling for the cause of the South. Moreover, when once the battle was joined, the forces of common tradition and of common blood asserted themselves strongly. Numerous poems depicted scenes on the battlefield where sons of the same mother clutched each other in the death-grapple. The outcome

of the struggle was to leave the idea of national sovereignty permanently and triumphantly established.

The period of Reconstruction, to be sure, was attended by a temporary widening of the breach between the North and the South. The man who had to begin life anew without his slaves and without a voice in the government was very likely to experience a depth of alienation that four years of armed conflict had not produced. Some Northern politicians, too, found it advantageous to foment as much hostility to the recently embattled section as possible. But even during this period the spirit of reconciliation was abroad. Henry Peterson's "Ode for Decoration Day" contained a section beginning—

O gallant foeman of the generous South,  
Foes for a day and brothers for all time.

In the same year a graduate of Yale, Francis Miles Finch, later a justice of the New York Court of Appeals, reflected in "The Blue and the Gray" the calmer feeling of the victorious section so perfectly that the poem became a classic in both North and South.

Several episodes in the growth of the reconciliation begun so early are indeed notable. When Senator Charles Sumner died on March 11, 1874, the Massachusetts delegation invited Lucius Q. C. Lamar, Congressman from Mississippi, to second the resolution for suspending the business of the House out of respect to his memory. His eulogy of the New Englander that 28th of April was expected to be only a perfunctory performance. But as he proceeded, the stillness of the House and galleries became almost oppressive. Speaker Blaine sat motionless, with tears running down his cheeks. Opponents in many a hot debate, Democrats and Republicans alike, were melted to tears. When Lamar sat down, all seemed to hold their breath, as if to prolong the spell. Then came a burst of hearty and sympathetic applause such as had not been heard since the war. Of all the speeches delivered in both houses, Lamar's alone was sent by telegraph to all parts of the country—a seemingly excessive tribute that was merited. For though Charles Sumner had been foremost among the leaders in the negro legislation of Congress,

Lamar's eulogy was conceived in the most magnanimous spirit and closed with a plea for a fuller understanding and a closer union.

How quickly the prayer was being answered, appeared in 1876. The hundredth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence was celebrated by the International Industrial Exhibition at Philadelphia. The honor of writing the official cantata for this national occasion was conferred upon the Southern poet, Sidney Lanier. The cantata, composed for Dudley Buck's music, was sung "in the open air, by a chorus of many hundred voices, and with the accompaniment of a majestic orchestra." Daniel Coit Gilman thus describes the event: "The devotional exercises awakened no sentiment of reverence. At length came the Cantata. From the overture to the closing cadence it held the attention of the vast throng of listeners, and when it was concluded loud applause rang through the air. A noble conception had been nobly rendered." Lanier was the first Southern poet to give a full, clear voice to the spirit of nationality.

Ten years later there was an equally enthusiastic demonstration in New York City. The New England Society extended an urgent invitation to Henry W. Grady, then managing editor of the *Atlanta Constitution*, to attend the annual banquet on December 22, 1886. He was a leader in his native state of Georgia. His father had lost his life at the head of the forlorn hope directed by General John B. Gordon against Fort Stedman, only two weeks before the surrender at Appomattox. Yet the son looked back on the struggle with no bitterness. The outcome he accepted loyally. To numberless rural audiences he preached the gospel of industrial alertness and national unity. He was largely instrumental in organizing the Atlanta exposition of the manufacturing and commercial progress of the South. Yet, as he was almost unknown in the North, when he stepped into the banquet hall of the New England Society, he expected to make a mere formal response to the toast, "The South." But the occasion proved inspiring. "When I found myself on my feet," he said, describing the scene on his return to Atlanta, "every nerve in my body was strung as tight as a fiddle-string,

and all tingling. I knew then that I had a message for that assemblage and as soon as I opened my mouth it came rushing out." This impromptu address, flashed over the country as "The New South," not only made Grady famous from coast to coast, but marked him as one of the potent influences in the unification of the once sundered sections.

That unification was actually taking place had been apparent at the death of General Grant in 1885. The last words made public from his bedside were: "I am thankful for the providential extension of my time to enable me to continue my work. I am further thankful, because it has enabled me to see for myself the happy harmony which has so suddenly sprung up between those engaged but a few short years ago in deadly conflict." The harmony was real. With only insignificant exceptions the Southern press used language like this from the *Mobile Register*: "The South unites with the North in paying tribute to his memory. He saved the Union. For this triumph—and time has shown it to be a triumph for the South as well as the North—he is entitled to, and will receive, the grateful tribute of the millions who, in the course of time, will crowd this continent with a hundred imperial states and spread to the world the blessings of republican freedom." Another paper of influence, the *Montgomery Advertiser*, remarked: "Looking at the life and character of General Grant from the broadest national standpoint, it is true to say that no man since Washington has better illustrated the genius of American institutions or the temper of Americans as a people."

A truer test of national spirit came in 1887, when it was shown that the survivors of the "lost cause" were as loyal to the Union as the survivors to the cause that won. In that year Adjutant-General Drum suggested the return of the Confederate battle-flags then in the War Department at Washington to the governors of the states from whose troops they were captured. President Cleveland accordingly ordered their return. A distinguished Union veteran, on hearing the news, shouted for Almighty God to blast the President with two strokes of paralysis, one in the hand and another in the brain. Other ejaculations almost as pious were heard from other old soldiers.

The attitude representative of the North, however, may be seen in Senator Hoar's address of welcome to the R. E. Lee Camp of Confederate Veterans of Richmond, Virginia, delivered at Faneuil Hall, Boston, on June 17, the day after Cleveland's revocation of the flag order. Senator Hoar said: "Your presence to-night is a token that the memories of four years cannot efface the memories of three hundred. . . . You have learned something of the Puritan. We too have learned to know as we never knew before the quality of the noble Southern stock; what courage in war; what attachment to home and state; what capacity for great affection and generous emotion; what aptness for command; above all, what constancy—that virtue beyond all virtues, without which no people can long be either great or free. . . . In the great and magnificent future which is before our country, you are to contribute a large share both of strength and of ornament."

The Southern spirit was equally admirable. When Governor Fitzhugh Lee of Virginia heard of the Northern protest over the return of the flags, he said: "The country should not again be agitated by pieces of bunting that mean nothing now. The South is part and parcel of the Union to-day, and means to do her part toward increasing its prosperity and maintaining the peace of the republic." The leading Southern newspapers treated the subject in a similar manner. The *Atlanta Constitution* said the flags would have been received "as a solemn pledge that the last spark of resentment between the two best armies the sun ever shone on had died out forever." It at the same time recorded its belief that "the great American heart can neither be misled or deterred. It has determined that there shall be peace. . . . The war is over—its results are fixed—its passions are dead; and its heroism and sacrifices have bound this people together as they were never bound before." It was therefore no exaggeration for that eminent Mississippian, L. Q. C. Lamar, in his oration at Charleston, the centre of secession, on the unveiling of the statue of Calhoun, the apostle of States' Rights, to declare that the appeal to arms in 1861 guaranteed and established "the indissolubility of the American Union and the universality of American freedom."

The progress of unification was furthered by the work of historians and biographers. Patriots like Lamar and Grady caught the heart of the people, but for permanence of good relations the public mind had also to be enlightened. Beginning with the last decade of the nineteenth century, students in American history who had been trained to scientific accuracy and impartiality in the growing universities of the country, brought into clear light the disputed causes of the war, and investigated the inner nature of the conflict and its results. The immediate effect was not always pacific. When a life of the Southern romancer, William Gilmore Simms, appeared in 1892, certain chapters that discussed without reserve his political activities raised such a storm of criticism that the young biographer was threatened with the loss of his position in a Southern college. Within ten years, however, many who still disagreed with the conclusions of the book were ready to admit the right of the author to express his opinion frankly and fearlessly. Richmond itself turned out to give him an enthusiastic welcome.

A broader influence was exerted by the novelists. The South took pride in the recognition of its writers by Northern magazines and publishers. The emergence of a new author was an occasion for demonstrations of sectional enthusiasm which at the same time bound the section to the nation by giving it a conscious share in the national life. Then came the vogue of the historical novel. For a time it seemed as if the Civil War and Reconstruction periods were the only ones novelists knew anything about. But though the field was much overworked, this activity had a salutary influence in acquainting the whole country with Southern civilization and conditions, and in setting the Southern people before the reading public in a new light. Indeed, one of these novels was reviewed at some length in a periodical of national weight devoted almost exclusively to politics and industrial progress. The prophecy of Lamar, "Know each other and you will love each other," was proving true.

The final stage in unification may be found in that ninety days' frolic known as the War with Spain. Congress removed

all discriminations against former Confederate officers. Wheeler's brigade at Santiago revived memories of his Civil War raids, and inspired many a generous poem like John Howard Jewett's "Joined the Blues." Indeed, North and South were drawn into relations of exultant brotherhood. The sacrifice of blood and gold in the cause of an oppressed people fostered an intensity of patriotic fervor that lifted national life from the individualism and sectionalism which had lingered on since the Civil War. This new patriotism was no spasmodic affair of the moment. Political parties were still fervidly debating about imperialism and the colonial policy when the assassination of McKinley, in 1901, startled the whole country. Professor William P. Trent, an acute observer, once remarked: "I recall vividly how I had to make a flying trip from North to South at the time, and how impressed I was with the fact that *not a particle of difference* could be noticed between the sections—both were deep in grief . . . I should say that few events of our time have brought out our essential unity more clearly than his assassination."

How true the observation was may be judged from an incident almost unnoticed at the time. On February 24, 1905, a bill for returning the Confederate flags was passed in Congress without a single dissenting vote, without even a single moment's debate. This result was not due to careful prearrangement. It was due to the spontaneous unanimity among the representatives of a harmonious people—a silent but impressive proof of the completeness of our union.

What makes our Civil War unique is this remarkable sequel. The most stubborn and tremendous fratricidal struggle of modern times has been followed by an unexampled obliteration of sectional animosities. The civil wars of France in the sixteenth century were followed by a century of faction. Only the iron rule of Richelieu, Mazarin, and Louis XIV kept this spirit from flaring up into conflagration. Undisturbed consolidation of power was not attained till the emigration of the Huguenot artisans robbed France of its industrial vitality. The English war of the Commonwealth in the seventeenth century was attended by a similar result. The Puritans, for a time tri-

umphant, were thereafter subjected to an aversion that for a hundred years made that name odious to the ruling powers of Great Britain.

That one generation has accomplished in America what a century could not accomplish in France or England is capable of one very easy explanation. We have lived in a swifter age than the world has before seen—an age of steam and electricity, resulting in a pace of industry and a volume of commerce hitherto unwitnessed. The civilization of the South has in a few years been transformed from the purely agricultural condition of ante-bellum times. Coal and iron have been found in untold quantities beneath the fertile soil. Manufactures have been developed with astonishing rapidity. Railways and telegraph lines have spread a network over the entire section, linking it with every part of our vast domain. Even widely distant regions have not been able to retain long the sense of separateness and the feeling of antagonism that brought on the war and were for a time strengthened by it. The torrent of natural life has swept away the bitter memories of brother struggling with brother. In both North and South faces are turned from the past, and hearts are filled with pride and hope and aspiration for the future of the republic.

But economic causes do not entirely explain the quickness of the result. This peculiarity of the Civil War is due to the American people themselves. The magnanimity which Grant displayed at Appomattox, the restraint which even political temper displayed during Reconstruction, stopping short of the confiscation of property and the execution of prominent leaders, the courageous acceptance of the issues which the South displayed at the close of an exhausting struggle and under the burden of a crushing social problem—these things furnish a new chapter in the history of the relations between victor and vanquished. Indeed, the sober truth of the matter is that the war, instead of splitting the country asunder, has cemented it more firmly than any other force could have done. Without an appeal to arms to settle forever and beyond question the differences that had arisen, the North would have grown more and more unlike the South. The sundering flood would have

become more and more impassable. The war removed from the South the cause of this growing alienation and thereby made possible a gradual but complete unification. Now no region in the whole land is more eager to claim its birthright as an integral and inseparable part of the American Union.

DUDLEY MILES.

Columbia University.

## SCIENTIFIC BOOK-MARKING

One of the cardinal sins, as impressed upon my boyhood, was the putting of any sort of mark in a book. Doubtless the kind of marks I was then disposed to make fully deserved extreme condemnation; and possibly I had an extreme inclination towards marking. Not many years ago while pursuing advanced work in a well-known university, I was summoned one day by the librarian, who, with serious countenance, demanded satisfaction for the "mutilation" of a certain book. The book in question had been used upon an important occasion when quick reference to certain passages was necessary; and in my reckless enthusiasm I had made a special pencil index on the first fly-leaf, referring to the particular topics and paragraphs deemed of possible value in an emergency, together with others thought desirable for future study. The offence was no doubt a heinous one, though the offender in the moment of transgression had almost imagined the value of the book enhanced by his lawlessness. But I was duly made to realize the seriousness of the case, and finally satisfied the indignant librarian by purchasing a brand-new copy of the book in exchange for the "mutilated" volume. The latter is still in my possession; and even yet I am uncertain whether to be sorry for my incorrigible propensity or not. Possibly it has been a desire to ease my conscience, or to justify my weakness, that has caused me to take an interest, if not a real pleasure, in the same propensity as manifested by other men, some of them distinguished scholars and authors. It is said, for instance, that there are extant ancient works on the solar system, as mapped by the Pythagoreans, with marginal notes made by Copernicus. On the other hand, there are numerous instances of book-lovers who regard their precious volumes with too much reverence ever to desecrate their pages with mark of pencil or pen. Of Horace Mann, for example, one of his biographers says: "He was taught to take care of the few books that the family had, as if they were sacred things. The habit followed him; he never dog-eared books, or profanely scribbled on their title-pages, or

margins, or fly-leaves; and would have stuck a pin through his flesh as soon as through the pages of a book." We cannot help admiring such a spirit and respecting such authority; and yet those of us who believe that books are made for use—not abuse—may get back to the text by calling attention in the above quotation to the qualifying term "profanely." Even the great schoolmaster Mann might have marked a book once in a while with reverence and a good reason.

The least valuable devices of book-marking are the most commonly used, and are often employed by the indiscriminate reader with disgusting prodigality. Perhaps the most common and commonplace of all is the line drawn under a word, phrase, or sentence. Such a mark put at the right place, and reserved until the right place is found, gains a new distinction, and may be of great value either in a hasty review or in a second careful reading. It has the same precarious usefulness as its counterpart in print, italic and bold-face type.

Of close kinship to the line drawn under the word are the marks that easily get upon the margin of the page. These, too, may be in place or out of place—helpful or worse than useless. A reference to another page or paragraph, where the same or a related topic is discussed, is easy to make and adds real value to the book. Such a reference may become still more valuable if it extends beyond the volume in which it is found, so as to afford a connecting link with another book, or with an article in a standard periodical.

Some readers invent a sort of sign code by which every mark has a particular meaning. Such a system would have much more to commend it if persons other than the first reader and marker could understand the various characters. A universal code might be devised and adopted, which would prove as valuable to book-readers and book-markers as does the code in general use among printers and proof-readers; for one of the chief objects in scholarly book-marking should be to make the marks intelligible to all readers. The library of a famous man, marked in such manner, becomes priceless in succeeding generations.

Some persons make a habit of pasting in their books, at the

proper places, clippings from magazines and newspapers, when such clippings are pertinent and contribute facts of importance; but too frequently such clippings are rendered practically worthless by being detached from their proper setting, and by having upon them nothing by which their authority can be established. Every clipping, used for this or any other purpose, to have full value, should be definitely labeled, so that the name of the periodical from which it has been taken, the date and place of publication, and, if possible, the name of the writer, can readily be determined.

Occasionally one finds in a periodical the picture of an author whose book has been read with much delight and profit, but whose face or portrait has never before been seen. Under such circumstances, and indeed under others also, the picture of the author may fittingly be clipped, and pasted as a frontispiece in his book. But even when this is done, a note should always be appended, stating the source from which the picture has been secured, and giving the date exactly or approximately. Once in a while one may by some means get a letter from a distinguished author, referring to something in one of his books. Then both the letter and the book referred to gain a double value and interest if the letter is securely and conveniently attached to the book in the proper place. Usually such a letter, especially if it is of any considerable length, is best placed at the beginning or end of the volume, where it is least in the way, and where a note on the adjacent fly-leaf will enable any reader to understand the situation and adjust the letter to its proper connection.

Frequently students in school and college do much book-marking to little purpose. Yet it is possible for them to make such marks as will help them materially. Explanatory notes made on the margin of the text-book during a lecture, whether the subject be literature or mathematics, will often be found of great assistance on review. Such notes are always at hand, just in the place they are needed, not buried out of sight and memory somewhere in the mass of paper and blurred pencil marks dignified by the name of note-book.

A certain old lady, almost illiterate, once known to the writer, had a method of marking her Bible that is worth mentioning.

According to a custom in her church, she heard a number of different preachers from Sunday to Sunday, and each day on reaching home she would mark around the text in her Bible, and write on the adjacent margin the preacher's name. In the course of many years her Bible came to have a peculiar value—at least to her. Other persons have been known to carry the same principle a step further. They have purchased Bibles with specially wide margins; and, in addition to marking the text and recording the preacher's name, they have written down also the date and a brief outline of the discourse. Preachers themselves have found such methods profitable. Moody's Bible was famous for its markings.

To reinforce and illustrate further this subject of book-marking, I shall cite a few more notable instances, and thus allow my readers to profit by the methods and scholarly habits of several distinguished men. It has recently been my privilege to examine the private libraries of Professor Dr. Martin J. Hertz (1818-1895), of the University of Breslau; Professor George F. Holmes (1820-1897), of the University of Virginia; and Professor Thomas Randolph Price (1839-1903), of Columbia University; and in each case the marks put upon the pages of certain books of the former learned professors are of greater interest and value by far than the books themselves. The books could in most instances, probably in every instance, be duplicated; but the marks are unique. Like old pieces of painting and sculpture, they could not be replaced if destroyed.

In order to be particular rather than general, I have selected for description a single volume from the Price collection and a single one from the Holmes collection, though the discussion of Dr. Hertz's method of book-marking shall not be correspondingly restricted.

The volume before me, marked by Professor Price, is an old text-book entitled, "*A Manual of English Literature*: By John S. Hart, LL.D." It was published at Philadelphia in 1872, and is a duodecimo of 636 pages, not counting a dozen pages at the end devoted to advertisements. From the neat inscription at the upper right hand corner of the title-page, it appears that the book was presented by the publishers, in the year of its first

appearance (1872), to Professor Price, who was then teaching Greek and English in the Randolph-Macon College, Virginia; and it was doubtless used by him for a number of years as a guide in lecturing to his English literature classes.

By actual count there are in this book 253 chirographic notes. They consist chiefly of statements supplementing the text, references to kindred works, and quotations from various authors. There are very few mere marks—unintelligible characters—to be found; and none such are included in the above enumeration. Open spaces between the printed lines are often utilized, as well as the margins of the pages; and the writing is done with the most remarkable skill and neatness, the written letters and words in many cases occupying less space than if they had been set up in agate type; yet they are as clear-cut and legible as print.

The four lines devoted in the text (page 75) to William Brown (1590-1645) are supplemented by the following, written on the adjacent interlinear and marginal space:—

He was a native of Devonshire, whose landscape beauties he celebrates—His pastorals one of the first examples of English rural poetry—Much admired and copied by Milton—There exists a copy of his Pastorals with MSS. notes by Milton—Extracts and Criticism in the Cornhill—cf. p. 219.

The reference, "p. 219," leads to the following, written in two lines at the bottom of the page:—

A good essay on 'English Rural Poetry' from the Cornhill Magazine in *Littell*, March, 72. Thomson's genius there discussed. His *Coriolanus*, his death, &c., noticed by Douglas. *Corr. Academy*, 5 Dec. 74.

Page 219 is mainly devoted to Thomson.

Following Hart's summary of the Ossianic controversy, Professor Price wrote, "Cf. *Languages and Literature of the Scottish Highlands*, by J. S. Blackie, Edinburgh, 1876"; and anent Charlotte Brontë he made this note: "C. B.'s genius compared with Miss Austen's in good essay *L.L.A. [Littell's Living Age]* April '82. *Jane Eyre*—as a play—cf. *Acad.* 13 Jan. '83."

The foregoing examples not only illustrate the explicit and

exact method of reference employed, but they also show, observing the dates, that the collection of notes in the volume was enriched from time to time over a period of more than ten years, beginning in 1872 at Randolph-Macon College and extending through the six years spent by Professor Price at the University of Virginia (1876-1882) into the period of his professorship at Columbia University.

The felicity displayed in the selection of quotations may be illustrated by the following examples, the first about Dante and Shakespeare, the second about Christopher Smart :—

(1) Two fit men : Dante deep, fierce as the central fire of the world ; S. wide, placid, far-seeing as the sun, the upper light of the world.

(2) He used to *walk* for exercise to the ale-house, but was *carried* back.

Not content with annotating the text from beginning to end, Professor Price also expanded the index to the volume by the addition of more than thirty items and references, each in its proper place alphabetically ; and at the very end of the book, on the fly-leaf following the advertising pages, he made this note :—

*Modern English*—by Fitz-Edward Hall, London, 1873.  
An effort to justify words and constructions condemned by grammarians.

Had it contained more pages, this book would in all probability have suffered still more extended "mutilation."

The volume chosen from the library of Professor Holmes for our study is even more remarkable than the one just described, both as to the number and the variety of annotations. Indeed, it is, without exception, the most "remarkably marked" book the writer has ever had the privilege of examining. Before speaking further of it, however, a brief sketch of Professor Holmes himself may be appropriate, since his career was no less varied and interesting than the marks he has left upon his book.

George Frederick Holmes was born at Demerara, British Guiana, in the year 1820. His college education was received at Durham University, England ; and he came to the United

States at the age of eighteen. After teaching in Virginia, Georgia, and South Carolina, he was admitted to the bar in the last-named State in 1842. In 1845 he became a professor in Richmond College, Richmond, Virginia; two years later he was made professor of history, political economy, and international law in the College of William and Mary; and in 1848 he was elected president of the University of Mississippi. Resigning from this position after a brief period, he returned to Virginia and engaged in literary work. In 1857 he was called to the University of Virginia as professor of history and literature; and he was still holding the chair of history and political economy at the time of his death, forty years later. He is the author of a series of school readers, an English grammar, a history of the United States, a volume of lectures on the Science of Society, and numerous reviews, essays, and encyclopædia articles. For some time he was assistant editor of the *Southern Review*.

Professor Holmes was affectionately spoken of among the students at the University of Virginia as "Daddy Holmes"; and it was commonly reported and believed that he could have filled with credit any chair in the University, not excluding the departments of law and medicine. His wit was spontaneous and brilliant; and toward the close of his life it became so irrepressible that his classroom was frequently in an uproar over it. He was forced to confess that two things, his wit and his hair, were beyond his control.

The particular volume selected for description from Professor Holmes's large collection is an octavo of 743 pages,—Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, the sixteenth edition, printed at London in the year 1838. According to the pen-note at the beginning of the volume, it came into Dr. Holmes's possession at "Charleston, So. Ca., 4 April, 1841." At the bottom of page 738—the end of the treatise proper—is written the following:—

Read 2nd time—Orangeburgh C. H.—13 October, 1843.  
Some Fragments of Burton well worth reading are extracted by Charles Lamb from an old common place book of our friend Democritus Junior and are given at the end of his works.

Throughout this yellowed old volume there are numberless dots, stars, index fingers, and fantastic crosses; but not counting

these there are 375 marks that may be called significant. That is, they consist of references, quotations, and statements that are intelligible to any reader. Speaking more exactly, they are intelligible if the reader is able to understand French, Latin, and Greek, as well as English, as he may come upon them at short notice; for there are numerous quotations in each of these languages.

Inside the first fly-leaf is a ten-line quotation from Jerome Cardan—"Dict. des Sciences Occultes, vol. 2, pp. 306-7." On the title-page, wedged in between two of the printed lines, is a short sentence about melancholy folk from Aristotle—"Eth. Nicom. Vol. VII. CXV." At the top of the first page of the treatise are written five lines from "Books and Reading," in the *Essays of Elia*. The reverse side of the title-page has been utilized for the following assemblage of quotations and references:—

In connection with the remarkable and entrancing work of Burton reference may be appropriately made to some of its predecessors: videlicet,

E. Puteani Democritus, sive de Risu Dissertatio Saturnalis, 1612.

" Lachrymarum Heracliti et Risus Democriti Scene—Paris, 1623.—12mo.

*Aretus.* tell us, pray, what devil

This melancholy is, which can transform  
Men into monsters.

*Corax.* You are yourself a scholar,  
And quick of apprehension: Melancholy  
Is not, as you conceive, indisposition  
Of body, but the mind's disease. So Extasy,  
Fantastic Dotage, Madness, Frenzy, Rupture [Rapture(?)]  
Of mere imagination, differ partly  
From melancholy; which is briefly thus,  
A mere commotion of the mind, o'ercharg'd  
With fear and sorrow; first begot i' the brain,  
The seat of reason, and from thence deriv'd  
As suddenly into the heart, the seat  
Of our affection.

Ford, *The Lover's Melancholy*, Act III. Sc. I. (1628.)  
So in Massinger's Play of *A Very Woman*—the character and practice of the Physician Panto appear to be taken from Burton. [Correction in pencil]: followed by—

See also Ben Jonson, *The Silent Woman*, Act IV. Sc. II.  
Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Noble Gentleman*, Act V. Sc. I.

Cross references, from one page to another, are frequent; but the great majority of the entries are quotations in point or original observations by the reader. A few examples may be worth while. On page 241 Burton says:—

For what matter is it for us to know how high the Pleiades are, how far distant Perseus and Cassiopea from us, how deep the sea, etc.? We are neither wiser, as he follows it, nor modester, nor better, nor richer, nor stronger, for the knowledge of it: *quod supra nos nihil ad nos*.

Dr. Holmes writes on the margin:—

Not so. It is well remarked, by Sir Jno. Herschel, that those studies and discoveries which have at first seemed wholly unavailable for any practical purpose have in the end proved the most beneficial of all.

And so neatly is it done that the thirty-six words can be covered with an ordinary postage stamp.

Further on Burton is discussing "rectified aire" as a cure for melancholy. He says:—

Julius Cæsar Claudinus, a physician, *consult.* 24 for a nobleman in Poland, melancholy given, adviseth him to dwell in a house inclining to the east, and by all means to provide the aire be cleer and sweet; which Montanus (*consil.* 229) counselleth the earle of Montfort his patient—to inhabit a pleasant house, and in a good aire. If it be so the naturall site may not be altered of our city, town, village, yet by artificiall means it may be helped. In hot countries, therefore, they make the streets of their cities very narrow, all over Spain, Africk, Italy, Greece, and many cities of France, in Languedock especially, and Provence, those southern parts: Montpelier, the habitation and university of physicians, is so built, with high houses, narrow streets, to divert the suns scalding rayes.

At this point the observation noted on the margin is as follows: "Thus Charleston, So. Ca., but Savannah, Mexico, etc., are *euphyriai*."

At another place the author, in enumerating compensations for physical defects, asks, "How many deformed princes, kings, emperours, could I reckon up, philosophers, orators?" and pro-

ceeds to give a list, to which the marginal note supplies additions, as follows:—

John Milton, blind; Dr. Johnson, with only one eye; Lord Byron, club-footed; Sir Walter Scott, lame; H. S. Legaré, both lame and deformed; Sir Wm. Blackstone, short-sighted.—I. Comm. p. xvii.

"If the king laugh, all laugh," in the text, is paralleled in the margin by the penciled words, "So. Ca. and J. C. Calhoun."

"A blessed partition" is the pen-note opposite the following:—

Another tale is there borrowed out of Aristophanes—In the beginning of the world, men had four armes and four feet, but for their pride, because they compared themselves with the gods, were parted into halves; and now peradventure by love they hope to be united again and made one.

A little further on, where it is declared, "*Fishes pine away for love and wax lean*, if Gomesius's authority may be taken," the marginal observation is merely, "An oyster may be crossed in love."

In his discussion of "Vain-glory, Pride, Joy, Praise," Burton declares:—

Another kind of mad men there is, . . . proud in humility; proud in that they are not proud; . . . [yet] like Diogenes, *intus gloriantur*, they brag inwardly, and feed themselves fat with a self-conceit of sanctity, which is no better than hypocrisie.

On the adjacent margin is written:—

He [the Devil] saw a cottage with a double coach-house,  
A cottage of gentility!  
And the Devil did grin, for his darling sin  
Is pride that apes humility.

—S. T. Coleridge, *The Devil's Thoughts*.

There are references to, or quotations from, Theognis, Hesiod, Homer, Herodotus, Plato, and Aristotle; Horace, Juvenal, Virgil, Cicero, Seneca, Tacitus, Quintilian, and St. Augustine; Herder, Schopenhauer, and Ranke; Rabelais, Montaigne, Cousin, Marot, and Voltaire; Chaucer, Izaak Walton, Ben Jonson, Bacon, Shakespeare, and the English Bible; Milton, Locke, Gib-

bon, Cowper, Sir Walter Scott, and Byron; not to mention others. Is not such book-marking worth while? If it be not so to the book-marker himself, it certainly is so to those who read his books after him.

The methods of marking followed by the eminent German, Professor Dr. Hertz, have much in common with those employed by Professor Price and Professor Holmes. How he ever found time, though he lived many years, to do it all, is the mystery; for among the ten or twelve thousand of his books and pamphlets, comprising a wide range of subjects, there are comparatively few that do not bear the marks of his scholarly hand.

In his volumes are found marginal notes similar to those made by Professor Holmes, though in most cases less numerous; and also interlinear markings, such as are found so frequently, in connection with marginal notes, in Professor Price's book; but the one feature that seems most distinctive in Professor Hertz's method is the use he makes of the fly-leaf at the beginning of the volume. Whether the marks in the book are many or few, the fly-leaf is almost invariably utilized. Sometimes only one or two items are found noted upon it; frequently only five or six; but occasionally it is wellnigh or completely filled; and once in a while the opposite cover of the book is also filled with lines of careful writing.

The matter of these fly-leaf notes consists usually of references to other publications on the same subject or related subjects; and the references include not only the name of the publication, but in most cases also the name of the author, the place and date of publication, and the particular page or pages of the work upon which are found the statements referred to.

In the Hertz library is a three-volume work on ancient law, by Karl F. Hommel, which had first been owned by the distinguished jurist and teacher, Eduard Böcking. From the inspection of the first volume of this work, it is evident that Böcking had the same habit as Hertz. On the first fly-leaf are the signatures, etc., of these two scholars, together with notes by Hertz showing how much he paid for the book, and that he had purchased it in the year 1871 — the year following Böcking's death; on the second fly-leaf, written in Böcking's elegant hand, is an

assemblage of quotations, etc., relating to the contents of the book; and on the title-page, also in Böcking's hand, is a pertinent interpolation.

Several significant features or qualities are common to the book-marking done by all of the scholars named. In the first place, they evidently knew, from the initial pen-stroke, just what they were about, and took their task seriously. Moreover, although the marking was not all done in any given volume at the first reading, but from time to time as the book was used, the work was always done systematically and consistently. But the thing that makes their marking most valuable to the persons who use their books to-day is this: They made complete and explicit statements. They wrote out fully, in plain English, French, German, Latin, or Greek, what they had to say, using no personal sign-code and but few even of the well-known abbreviations. They did not refer merely to such and such an author, but to the particular work of that author; not merely to a volume, but to the particular page in that volume. The place and date of publication, as well as the title and the author's name, were noted when these were necessary or helpful.

Finally, the thing that makes the book-marking of these scholars most admirable is the care, neatness, and skill with which they did it. Hardly ever did they use anything but a fine-pointed pen and good ink. Pencil marks are very rare. Careless book-marking always looks like child's-play or vandalism. Crooked lines, sprawling words, and letters a quarter of an inch high are permanent eyesores anywhere, whatever the value of the information thus conveyed may be; and nowhere in the world does such scribbling look so ill as upon the margin of a well-printed book. But the lines of Hertz and Holmes and Price and Böcking are straight; the words are as compact as print; and the letters are almost invariably as small as agate or pearl type. Their books are not marred or "mutilated" but embellished by their marking. Thus beauty adds its argument to that of utility; and we give our vote unreservedly in favor of book-marking; but always in favor of neat, scholarly, and, if one may use the term, scientific book-marking.

JOHN WALTER WAYLAND.

Harrisonburg, Virginia.

## THE ARTHURIAN DRAMAS OF EDUARD STUCKEN

Eduard Stucken published his first drama, *Yrsa*, in 1897, when he was thirty two years of age.<sup>1</sup> Neither this nor his other dramas in prose since published give a very definite idea of his talent. *Myrrha*, a fate-play; *Die Gesellschaft des Abbé Chateauneuf*, a tragicomedy dealing with the story of Ninon de L'Enclos; *Astrid*, a drama of Iceland in the eleventh century, are not remarkable works. A volume of *Ballads*, however, in 1898, shows that verse is a more suitable medium for Stucken's expression. In them he shows himself to be master of moods and promises more than ordinary splendor of language. Yet what is gained in art is lost in interest. These ballads are like flowers grown on foreign soil. They bring with them a heavy, depressing, at times terrifying, atmosphere, in which nothing human can survive.

In 1902 Stucken published his first Arthurian drama, entitled *Gawan*. *Lanval* followed this in 1903, and then *Lanzelot* in 1908.<sup>2</sup> Our first impression upon opening any of these three plays is that they are different not only from the other works of their author but perhaps from anything we have ever seen before. We find an easy control of rhyme and rhythm and a frank committal to their effects, an unhindered flow of language, a wealth of imagery, a sensuous, oriental opulence, a scenic suggestiveness that it would be difficult to parallel. Out of his language the poet constructs the mediæval cathedral into which we enter as into the proper gloom, and his language furnishes also the music that aids in subjecting us to his spell. Stucken thus commits himself at the outset to a realm of wonder, of unbounded imagination and fancy. He invites us to survey a wide and mystic scene. We know from the first line that we need not expect simplicity. To some there is nothing in all this ambitious verse but effort, bombast, unnaturalness, to others there is art, expression, beauty.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cf. *Das literarische Echo*, 11. Jahr, Heft 21-22.

<sup>2</sup>These dramas, as well as the works mentioned in the first paragraph, can be had of the Erich Reiss Verlag, Berlin-Westend.

In the first place, Stucken's chosen verse in these dramas is anything but simple. It is capable of great freedom. It might be briefly described as an anapestic movement with five stressed syllables. Yet the character of the verse is seldom purely anapestic, since the poet omits at will anywhere from one to five of the unstressed syllables, thus ranging as far as a plain iambic pentameter. The omission of the unstressed syllable is skilfully used by the author to get a retarding effect in his line when he wishes it. The plain pentameter is much more infrequent than the full anapest, but the latter is not allowed to make the rhythm monotonous. To these rhythmic effects must be imagined those of double rhymes, one in the line, often at a pause and rhyming with a word in the following line that may or may not be in an exactly corresponding position; the other at the end of the line, rhyming with the end of the next line. There is usually a pause in the verse, coming at intervals of two or three stressed syllables, though sometimes after the first or fourth, while now and then a line flits by without any breathing space. Stucken manages this verse with great mastery, especially in *Lanval*, the first fifteen lines of which well illustrate its capabilities.

And then the language of these dramas is no less unusual than the metre. It is full of sound and color. There is a distinct effort for color, a choice of highly imaginative words, words that suggest as many beautiful images as possible. A special art is made of this alone. Beauty for its own sake is expressly sought and found. Stucken goes out of his way to discover similes and metaphors of a strange, weird beauty, as if he were determined to arouse us to the presence of something unusual in the object he is describing—it is no ordinary object, or it shall not be seen in the ordinary way. The poet is very insistent that we open our inner vision to the light of poetry that emanates from the thing itself. The language is full of expressions that suggest subtle, hypnotic powers exerted by one person over another. In this respect Stucken's *Ballads* are uncanny, and even the Arthurian dramas do not always escape a suggestion of unhallowed magic. An instance is Fingula's influence over Lanval, when she speaks of her face as a *Giftblumenangesicht*. The poet delights also in elaborate personifica-

tion and metaphor, and at times his fancy runs riot. Take, for example, the following passage, where Lanval summons Fingula to appear at court:—

“Wherever you may be, whether deep beneath the hills, whether fluttering in the heavens you chase upon silvery wings, or diving for pearls you swim on the azure seas; whether you are tuning the gold strings of a harp on a carpet of tulips, or offering your breasts to the calf of the gazelle in the solitude of the forest, where the yellow, matted unicorn shrieks; or whether you fill slim vases of sardonyx with your tears, or mirror your pale features in marble fountains, or are combing your long, silken locks of fire, or counting the opals of your rings and bracelets—wherever you may be, whatever you may be doing, leave the costly things and the place where you are, and in your swan-raidment fly over the sea and enter here like one of the wise virgins.”

In the plots of these dramas Stucken has followed well-known sources, though in every case with interesting deviations. These deviations are remarkable in *Gawan*, more so in *Lanval* and of still greater significance in *Lancelot*.

The source for *Gawan* is the old English poem, *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*. This he follows in its main outlines, not hesitating also to use such striking expressions from the original as seemed adapted to his purposes. The first act shows us the Round Table at Christmas-tide, the king unwilling to taste food before some adventure has been related or experienced. Kay announces the arrival of the Green Knight, who offers his remarkable challenge: he is willing to bow his head for one stroke of the axe now, if the knight accepting will receive a stroke from him one year hence at a place to be specified in event of his survival. Gawan accepts the challenge and strikes off the Green Knight's head. The latter sets it on again and rides away with the request that Gawan meet him twelve months hence in a place called the Green Chapel. In the second act Gawan, after many hardships, arrives at the castle of Hautdesert, who is none other than the Green Knight, though Gawan does not know it. This act and the third and the fourth are taken up with the promise that Hautdesert exacts from

Gawan to exchange whatever they may win during the time Gawan remains with him, the host on the chase, the guest in the castle; and further with the temptation of Gawan by Haut-desert's wife, and his successful resistance. He fails, however, in one little particular: he accepts as a gift the girdle of Haut-desert's wife, because she promises that it will charm his life against all attempts, even those of magic. When the exchange of booty is effected, Gawan gives faithfully, according to his pledge, the kiss he had received from Marie, but he retains the girdle—though even this is much against his will—and is thus guilty of violating his word. The fifth act finally shows us what occurs when Gawan reaches the Green Chapel.

The most interesting deviations from the source are found from certain parts of the third act to the end of the play, and have to do with a subject familiar to all readers of recent German dramas: the problem of death. Indeed, the possibilities of this theme in the story must have been one of its most attractive features for the author. The original merely offers the suggestion—love of life tempts Gawan to offend against his knightly honor. It is this situation that Stucken siezes upon to introduce a good deal of modern thought about death. Marie de Hautdesert in her temptation of Gawan presents with all conceivable eloquence the contrast between life in its fullness, where sin itself is a virtue, and death, which is extinction. "Beautiful," she says, "is the Angel of sin." When Gawan pleads that he wishes, should he die young, to inherit the kingdom of heaven, this is her reply: "That you are pure and without blemish is your misfortune. Of what avail to you in the dull coffin is Heaven's favor? In the desolate vault, of what avail is Heaven's blessing? In the crypt and in the mouldy air fall no showers of blossoms. Can Heaven restore to you the light of the sun?" What is the value of a life that was never once drunk with roses and wine, that never beheld the glacier-summits and the abysses of existence?—

Euch hat nie Frau Venus berückt, Hörselbergs Zierde;  
Und ihr habt nie das Tollkraut gepflückt unersättlicher Gierde.

The fifth act shows still better how great a charm this problem of death exercised over the poet's imagination. Gawan,

realizing more fully than the English original the extent of the sin he has committed in violating his pledge for fear of death, approaches the Green Chapel as a man conscious of his doom. He has closed accounts with life and sees in death only the just atonement for his wrongdoing. The Green Chapel is a place of horror—a kind of cell in a rocky cliff, before which is a graveyard surrounded by an iron fence. It is midnight, the appointed time, and Gawan is scarcely able to discern the ivy that grows thickly about the entrance. As the door of the chapel opens with a grating noise the darkness is illumined by a flood of green light which proceeds from a hanging lamp in the interior. Toward the front of the chamber is a coffin, surrounded by candelabra. In the background an altar, and in a niche above this a painted wooden image of the Virgin Mary. Gawan enters as if he had "expected something else." He confesses his sins to the Mother of Christ and then calls aloud for his adversary to appear. Twelve strokes of a clock are heard and the Green Knight arises from the coffin. Undismayed the hero bows his head to receive the stroke of the axe. But this is never delivered, for the Virgin descends from her niche to declare him worthy of life. The Green Knight acquiesces with Mephistophelian irony (the only touch, by the way, of this trait in his character), and we now learn that the whole conflict has resulted from a wager between the Virgin and Death, who is Hautdesert. God, who sends "temptation as a blessing," had given Gawan, like Job, into Death's hands to be tested. Death thinks out the severest trial. He persuades the Virgin to clothe a sinful, freeborn sylph in her own pure form, and it is this creature who, in the person of Marie de Hautdesert, had all but brought the hero to his fall. Yet, as the Virgin had foreseen, he had withstood the dangerous lures of life and conquered in his soul the fear of death. Now he is worthy to drink from the Holy Grail. As this ceremony is performed, the curtain falls on the closing act.

In the original, Hautdesert and his wife are only human. In his castle lives Morgan le Fay, skilled in magic. She is responsible for the adventure, having sent Hautdesert to Camelot "to test the truth of the renown that is spread abroad of the

Round Table. She taught me this marvel, to betray your wits, to vex Ginover and fright her to death by the man who spake with his head in his hand." In making this important change, Stucken was of course under the spell of the fascination exercised by the figure of death over much of modern art—death, as one of the most mysterious phases of the entire problem of life, which again has shaken us out of our complacency as rudely as if it had never been touched. So many of the German writers seem anxious to read into this phase some human reason, and Death appears on the scene again and again—not as the skeleton of Everyman, but, as if by common consent, in kindlier form. For one, he teaches that he is a renewer of life, who prevents a single form from usurping the place of new and varied forms; for another, he calls himself the great god of the soul, present in all genuine moments of life, teaching how to live. In our play, too, he has human qualities, and though an enemy of Gawain, gives him good advice and warning. Yet this *Mysterium*, as Stucken calls it, differs from most of the death-dramas in showing the triumph of life, while they show the victory of death. In addition to the general popularity of the figure of death, there was, we may add, a special fitness in changing Hautdesert into Death in this instance: the victory of the hero over the fear of death could not be made more complete than by having him vanquish his adversary in person. Thus Stucken simply acted on the suggestion contained in his source.

If in *Gawan* the poet was somewhat bound by a legend, the general tendency of which was determined by Christian faith, his treatment of *Lanval* allowed him to make his characters more often representative of modern moods: life for life's sake, rather sensuous than moral, rather restive than serene, and when crossed by misfortune rather rebellious than resigned. The outline of *Lanval* is briefly this:—Lanval is a young knight of the Round Table, whose fortunes need mending. For this reason Briant, his brother, and his uncle, Baldewin, have planned for him to marry Lionors, the niece of Arthur and the sister of Agravain. But Lanval has united himself with Fin-gula, a swan-princess, over whom he obtained power by stealing

her swan-raiment. He is bound to her by a promise of secrecy. Unfortunately, however, Lionors is very much in love with Lanval, and Arthur offers her to him to wife. He is compelled before the assembled court to give his reason for not accepting her. He is taunted by Queen Ginover when he refuses to tell the name of his wife and where she has made her abode. In answer to these taunts he forgets himself so far as to declare that his wife is the most lovely woman living, far more lovely than the Queen herself. The latter receives this as might be expected, and Lanval is now forced to summon his wife that the Round Table may decide upon the issue. He calls Fingula, but she does not appear, because, as Lionors later suggests, Lanval would expose the delicate flower of their happiness to the common gaze. Lanval is saved from the loss of his honor and expulsion from the Round Table only by a speedy and secret alliance with Lionors. The task of making this plausible is solved well enough. When the judges bid him produce his wife or be declared guilty of perjury, he can point to Lionors. At this point, however, Agravain rises to accuse Lanval of double marriage. Driven to despair and contempt of life by all that has happened so suddenly, he denies all knowledge of Fingula, and declares his supposed experience to have been a dream. This statement is gainsaid by a marvelous sign. In a speech full of grandiose irony and rebellion against destiny, Lanval challenges a second Daniel to enter and interpret this sign. A knight in black armor enters upon this challenge and fights with Lanval. Lanval slays the knight, who is then seen to be Fingula. Her swan-brothers appear and bear her off to Avelun, where alone Lanval shall ever see her again. Lanval's last words, just before he is killed by Agravain, his implacable enemy, are those of bitter protest against his experience and of intense hatred of Lionors, who was throughout actuated only by the purest affection for him.

What Stucken owes in the main to well-known sources and what he has chosen to invent will be plain enough without further comment. As far as clearness goes *Lanval* is open to more serious objection than *Gawan* or *Lanselot*. Even the beautiful language, which in this play attains its greatest perfection, can-

not make us forget this at every point. For example, the real nature of Fingula, the swan-girl, is not plain. A certain degree of mystery is necessary, of course, but the description Fingula offers of herself at her first meeting with Lanval eludes every effort of the imagination to discern any certain creature, whether sylph, fairy or woman. She is as old as the fairy flower that grows in primeval waters, eternally young like Astarte; she longs for the peace that death brings, yet is immortal; she yearns for the bliss of love, but this is not for her—we do not know why. She is a beautiful horror, a childish devil. In each of her limbs dwells a witch. To kiss her is to renounce God, to love her is to be damned, for the horrors of her breast are seven times seven. This is undoubtedly a bit of poetic frenzy. And besides this, there are obscure parts of the plot which would occur readily to any reader.

But all this does not overbalance the beauties of the drama in other respects, and *Lanval* is in some ways one of the most adequate expressions to be found of life as viewed by German poets of recent years. Throughout it breathes that distinctly modern atmosphere in which the sensuous and the spiritual blend with such harmony that one seems to be resolved into the other. The emotions of its persons might be termed, if we may borrow a word, monistic. There is but the slightest trace of Christian dualism, and that is rather traditional than vital. Life is conceived of as an organic unity, a harmonious process where little is heard of a conflict between mind and sense. The tendency is pantheistic. Motives of morality yield to motives of personality. There are no eternal truths, but only ever-recurring emotions. "I fear not Belial, not the thunders of God nor the day of doom if I may possess you", declares Lanval in answer to Fingula's warning. These lines and this character give a pretty complete expression to a certain kind of modern renaissance spirit. Tolstoi notices this resemblance in the following characteristic language: "The chief mistake made by men of the highest classes of the so-called Renaissance,—a mistake which we are continuing to make at the present time, did not consist in their having ceased to value religious art and to ascribe any meaning to it . . . . but in this that in place of this absent religious art they

put an insignificant art which had for its aim nothing but man's enjoyment."<sup>3</sup> This applies, of course, in a sense to the writers of the present day. Only, the present-day writers are even more radical, for they attempt a total revaluation of motives and actions. Sin is no longer sin; virtue no longer virtue. Fidelity to the strong, pure passion of the heart is the chief article of the creed. Fear of death and of what may come after it yields to fear of a passionless life. Great experience is sought at any cost. "I will smile meantime, until fortune destroys me, the cruel fortune that has taken us prisoner will be blissful torment." Lanval swears not by God, but by the tears of his beloved. To Agravain he says:—

Ich kenne nicht Zwang.

Ich gehorchte meinem Herzen mein Leben lang.

We do not see persons that move against a background of settled principles, amusing themselves within defined limits; rather such as are inclined to overstep all limits hitherto accepted, and seeking new principles to accord with the needs of a new experience. Lanval represents the despair of finding such principles. He has none of the calm faith that supports Gawan. In the last moment of his life he bursts forth with a bitter arraignment of the powers that shaped his destiny. Nor does he find rest until through the gates of death he follows his swan-princess to the mystic shores of Avelun. This, too, being the best answer that much of modern poetry has for its great questioners and sufferers—a vision of rest unruffled by any passion: death, cessation, Avelun.

The confession of this personal creed might be illustrated by many other passages from *Lanval*, especially by the beautiful character of Lionors. But even more strikingly by the characters and story of *Lancelot*. This drama might have been called *Lancelot and Elaine*, dealing as it does with that episode. Yet this title would have been too narrow, since there are crowded into this tense work the fortunes of Arthur and Ginover as well. Stucken has combined the two Elaine stories in *Morte d'Arthur*, and added the destinies of Elaine, the daughter of Pelles (Book

---

<sup>3</sup> *What is Art?*

XI, Chs. i, ii), to those of Elaine le Blank. (Book II, Ch. xv, has also furnished certain suggestions.) Pelles is changed to Anfortas, who is thus made the father of Elaine and Lavaine. The first act and part of the second are laid in the Grail Castle. One important result of these changes is that Elaine has greater rights in Lancelot through the birth of a son to him, and hence the situation between Lancelot and Ginover is made more interesting. Ginover, feeling her power over him wane, resorts to deception in order to shield him from Elaine's purer love. It is the discovery of this deception that determines Lancelot's final break with her. Lancelot is a man who vainly strives to free himself from a baneful influence. In truth he loves Elaine and divines, though dimly, that she stands above all other women of earth. When this bursts upon him in its full light Elaine is already on her last earthly pilgrimage in the funeral barge.

Lancelot is entirely a character of Stucken's own making. In the old book he is praised as a model knight because of his unremitting service of one woman. He deceives the king without much compunction. The shade of remorse and discontent that Tennyson brings into his portrait is well known—his features showed a trace of the "great and guilty love he bore the queen," and he thought of what might have been had Elaine crossed his way before. It is here that Stucken takes his starting point. Lancelot becomes a veritable Tannhäuser seeking deliverance from the Venusberg. Like Tannhäuser, too, though with greater reason, he is rejected by the highest religious authority (here the Holy Grail), and returns to his sinful life.—

Ihr zwingt mich ohne Erbarmen mit wildem Fluche,  
Dass ich in Frau Venus' Armen das Vergessen suche!

And finally, like Tannhäuser, he is saved by the death of a pure woman.

Everything in Lancelot's actions hinges on the creed of personality. Many things are allowed by this creed, only not infidelity to one's self. Everybody in the drama is tested by this standard. Lancelot has really been false to himself in his love for Ginover, for he has deceived the friend of his choice. It is this that makes him wretched:—

Wär der Ehebruch verzeihlich,— der Freundesverrat  
Wär es nimmermehr!

Yet this creed of personality, like others not without its contradictions, binds him to his sin. That which has given him hours of genuine pleasure he can never renounce and deny.—

Schön waren, unvergesslich, der Schände Nächte!  
Ein Glück so unermesslich gewährt nur das Schlechte!

So in the very presence of the Holy Grail itself he refuses to forswear the bliss he has had. This scene is a veritable fiat of the personal creed. Rather than abjure, Lancelot will give up the blessing of the Grail. "I have humbled myself too deeply—I will do it no longer. I will not curse what has made me happy. . . . I am firm; no power in the world can force me! It would seem a disgrace to me should I weep for what I have done; a cowardly thing, treason of myself should I repent of the joyous torments of my life and grieve at the tomb of my pleasure. No,—a defiant pride even swells my heart that the first woman of the world was my paramour." And that which finally determines his break with the Queen is a motive of the same kind: his relation to Elaine. He fears that he has slain her soul, and when he realizes his love for her, the abhorrence of the Queen that the Holy Grail could not wring from him he now confesses of his own accord.

The character of Elaine is the most beautiful in the drama. Stucken has here made use of a type familiar enough in German literature—the woman whose life is absorbed by one love. From the peasant's daughter in Hartman, to her counterpart, Ottogebe, in Hauptmann, this type has fascinated good and indifferent writers. In Elaine Stucken has added a worthy representative. The scenes in which she figures show him to be master of the language of the heart. Elaine is naïve in the least as in the most significant of her actions. She is not bothered by scruples of propriety or appearance when there is a question of getting what she wants. She plays at nothing, for her it is always a matter of life and death. Not for the sake of her father, not even for the salvation of the entire Grail Kingdom, would she sacrifice her virgin honor, but for the love and salvation of Lancelot she does it. She is one of those persons who

are all soul, who are dangerous to have about us because they are the most absolute test of our nature. They never bear malice, yet to do them wrong is the greatest misfortune that can befall us. They serve no custom, being a law unto themselves, and are ready to bring the last sacrifice even unto death. Such a character is Elaine in this drama. She is indeed a wonderful person in *Morte d'Arthur* and in Tennyson. There are few more touching appeals than her last letter. But in Stucken's drama the entire situation, and hence every detail of it, gains greater pathos by the fact that she is the mother of Lancelot's child, that she has for his sake endured exile from home and all the miseries of hunger and cold, that she has won his love and is just barely kept from him by the jealousy of the Queen. And this gloom is set off by a lovely spiritual light, for her final triumph, though bought with death, is absolute.

Ginover, too, is a thorough woman of the modern renaissance. She is not afraid of sin, of discovery, of the King's wrath. She fears only one thing, the loss of Lancelot's love, only one person, Elaine. She fights a losing battle and is conscious of her weakness. Hence she is driven to deceive Lancelot himself, and this is a kind of a deception that the religion of personality forbids. Ginover excommunicates herself. Elaine, on the other hand, remains true to herself, and these two characters make an effective contrast.

But, after all, the view taken by the modern renaissance of the relation between Arthur, Lancelot, and Ginover is shown most clearly in the attitude of Arthur himself. This is entirely different from that of the moral Arthur in Tennyson, and it is here that Stucken goes to the extreme of the modern standpoint. His Arthur will not even question Lancelot's relation to the Queen. When certainty is in his hands he throws away the means of assuring himself. He goes so far as to declare Lancelot innocent even though he should be proved guilty. "Is there innocent guilt?" asks Agravain, and the King replies: "Not the deed, the will decides." There is a higher justice, such as we may hope for from God, which determines guilt by motive alone, not by the appearance of the deed. Thus Arthur lays the basis for his final attitude to Lancelot and Ginover.

Who understands all will forgive all. Lancelot by his pilgrimage to the Grail has proved his desire for purity—that must decide. It would have been better, of course, had he been successful, but “where higher powers make sport of us, all guilt grows pale.” And as for Ginover, he assumes the larger share of guilt to himself—had he not neglected her? Had he not repelled her by his coldness? And as for guilt, what is the use of talking about guilt at all in the matter?—

Nicht Lieben und Lieben—Gesckick ist's! Wer kann ihm entrinnen?

Thus the modern writer joins hands with Malory, for “that is true, said the King and many Knights: Love is free in himself and will never be bounden; for when he is bounden he loseth himself.”

This referring everything to the personal is strongly marked in contemporaneous poetry, love, friendship, the sensuous, death—these things are concrete: duty is an abstraction. Richard Hovey makes Launcelot say:—

“Duty! The word is colder than the moon.”

This implies it is wrong to stifle the personal for the sake of duty. Yet there is no attempt on Stucken's part to grasp and solve the fundamental problem of society such as we find in the beautiful fragment of Hovey's lofty work. Stucken leaves the state out of the matter. Perhaps in the ideal realm of his dreams there is no state.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Virginia.

## SLAVERY IN MISSISSIPPI

It has been nearly half a century since slavery ceased to exist in the United States. We are now standing in the light of the twentieth century, where we can look back over events not so close to our vision that we cannot see them in clear perspective and consider them with unbiased judgment. Yet, when we view a period of past history, like the one under consideration, it is difficult to reproduce in imagination the social and economic conditions of the time, the general attitude of the people toward the negro's ability and station in life, the increase in wealth due to his labor and the consequent effect upon the planter and slave, together with the growing difficulties of emancipation.

Thus in taking Mississippi as a type of the far southern state, possessing a soil and climate not only peculiarly fitted to slave labor but almost excluding white labor from agricultural pursuits, we must so far as possible seek to learn the attitude of her people toward an institution, which, when she became a territory of the United States in 1798, was already wrought into the very fibre of her being.

History points us back to the day when the first colony was planted on Mississippi ground before the French had learned to look to the soil for subsistence. Iberville, the founder, was instructed "to breed the buffalo at Boloxi; to seek for pearls; to examine the wild mulberry with the view to silk, the timber for ship-building, and to seek for mines."<sup>1</sup> Nothing was said about planting grain. A few years later, when Bienville was appointed governor, he insisted that the supplies of the colony should be made on the rich soil it possessed. "But it was impossible to make the French work, and many of the Indians whom they had subjected deserted to their own villages. He proposed to send Indians to the West Indies and exchange them for slaves. This the minister pronounced impracticable and

---

<sup>1</sup> Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State, by J. F. H. Claiborne, p. 27.

recommended a direct importation from Africa. This is the first suggestion of African slavery in the history of the territory." In 1720 the first cargo from Africa was imported.

Thus we have slavery early incorporated into the life of the settlers. And as year by year the tobacco, indigo, and cotton returns held out bright promise of success, slaveholders from Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee travelled in wagons to this fertile region of the Mississippi basin. Lands were procured with but little trouble and expense. The immigrant had but to obtain an order from the governor for a piece of the central table-land covered with rich loam, or, more preferable still, a section of the alluvium-covered bottom lands. If no obstacle prevented, the grant was issued for a small fee sufficient to pay the surveyor. These lowlands of the Mississippi and Yazoo, the Tombigbee, Big Black, and the Pearl covered an area of over one-sixth of the entire state and offered unrivalled soil and the advantages of easy exportation. Of this region, the Mississippi-Yazoo Delta, aptly termed "the cream jug of the continent," occupies the greater part.

Various inventions, increasing tremendously the demand for cotton, also played no small part (during the years from 1790 to 1820) in luring planters to this favored region. Steam-driven machines for spinning and weaving the cotton had been started in England,<sup>2</sup> and the gin, a machine for performing the tedious task of separating the cotton fibre from the seed, instead of releasing slave hands from labor, increased the desire for cultivation and merely put those hands and many more to work on the cultivating and picking process. Immense estates were opened, stocks of slaves needed, and thus a sudden impetus was given to the slave trade. Nor was the enterprise of the New England States slow to perceive the prospect of rich gains to be made in supplying the demand for cheap negro labor.

Only a few years before these discoveries in machinery, all the colonies felt the advisability of doing away with slavery and thought that it would gradually die out. Leaders such as Franklin, Henry, Jefferson, and Jay showed their avowed hos-

---

<sup>2</sup> A History of the United States, by John Fiske, p. 310. 1797.

tility to the system. And in making the laws for the government of the Northwest Territory, there was but one dissenting voice<sup>3</sup> against the clause prohibiting "involuntary servitude," and this was from a delegate from New York. Again, the convention which framed our constitution felt unanimously the need of putting a stop to the importation of slaves, though it is interesting here to note that Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Connecticut, whose merchants were engaged in the business, joined with South Carolina and Georgia in insisting upon a few more years before the final prohibition.<sup>4</sup> The date fixed upon was 1808. At the time when this prohibition went into effect, "the state of Rhode Island alone numbered fifty-four vessels engaged in the slave trade." All of the Thirteen Original States held slaves. But in the northern states the numbers were few, for there was no labor that a white man could not do better. No special sacrifice was required to gradually abolish slavery where Nature's stern laws forbade the negro's labor, nor was the exercise of any great philanthropy needed for a state like Vermont to emancipate her slaves<sup>5</sup> when at the census of 1790 there were but seventeen in the whole state.<sup>6</sup> How utterly different was the situation in Mississippi where, so far as we can ascertain the population that same year, there were upwards of 3,400 slaves, who constituted a part of the agricultural development of the state.

Finding the negro a part of the social system, the Mississippian, like other southern planters, sought to defend the institution in speech and through the press. Sermons were preached citing biblical authority: "Not condemned in Abraham"; "Sanctioned by the Decalogue"; "Not condemned by Christ and the Apostles—then not necessarily wrong." It was also confirmed and sanctioned by a constitution that they loved and honored. Was it not a necessary stage between savagery and

---

<sup>3</sup> *An Historical Sketch of Slavery from Earliest Periods*, by T. R. R. Cobb, p. 170. 1858.

<sup>4</sup> *The Critical Period of American History, 1783-1789*, by John Fiske, p. 264. 1897.

<sup>5</sup> *State Bill of Rights, 1777*.

<sup>6</sup> *An Historical Sketch of Slavery from Earliest Periods*, p. 171.

civilization? It inculcates "habits of industry, improves the physical man, tames wild propensities and passions," said a writer<sup>1</sup> of Columbus, Mississippi (1846). "The savage man is necessarily inclined to indolence and inaction except when engaged in the chase and in war. No savage tribe has ever yet voluntarily betaken itself to habits of industry; consequently all that reach civilization must pass through the ordeal of slavery." Statistics, even before the year 1845, showed a greater number of negroes in the slave states, converted and admitted into the church, than had resulted in all the years of missionary labor in Africa. Educationally, he maintained, the slave was much benefitted. "Many put to trade make good mechanics. Most of the field hands become good farmers." "These are all important branches of education, for aptness in the use of tools and implements quickens the mental powers."<sup>2</sup> "The negro in Africa is as ignorant to-day as he was a thousand years ago," says another Mississippi writer of the day,— "just so far as slavery in the United States is superior to African slavery as it exists in Africa to-day, just so much good has resulted from the slave-trade."

In addition to these observations the planter reasoned: "Is not the negro peculiarly fitted for his station in life?"—his thick, oily, sunburnt skin that allows him to enjoy basking in a semi-tropical sun; his mental inferiority, proved by the fact that he has always been subservient to the white race, except where he outnumbers them so greatly as to leave no alternative; that he does not chafe in a condition of bondage as other peoples do, but is contented and care-free unless treated with cruelty as in the West Indies. "He knows he is not and never can be the white man's equal and in most cases does not even desire it."

The planters called attention to the benefits to the country at large due to the system: (1) Large tracts of land abounding in marshes and ponds would go to waste merely because no white man could be induced on account of the dangers to his constitution to undertake voluntarily to remove such sources of

---

<sup>1</sup>A Defence of Negro Slavery as it Exists in the United States, by Matthew Estes, p. 121.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid. p. 123.

diseases. The negro, on the contrary, is not anything like, to the same extent, subject to these diseases and can perform the labor without injury to his constitution. Thus the health of the country is materially improved. (2) "The products of slave labor constitute the basis of much of the wealth of this country and also of Europe." Great was the confidence in the cotton crop. "Destroy the production of cotton at the south and you will almost ruin Europe and America,"<sup>9</sup> boasts the Mississippian. (3) "Slavery adds security and strength to the South in a military point of view."—The other side had been arguing that the slaves would join hands with any foe that invaded the country, but our Mississippi writer cites, among other instances, that of Lord Dunmore, governor of Virginia, who offered freedom and gold to the slaves of the state if they would join the British in fighting against their masters; but they remained faithful.

To these points of view were added the difficulties of emancipation. Very many of the Mississippi slave-owners looked upon slavery as a heavy responsibility and "longed to be rid of it, but they were not able to give up their young and valuable negroes, nor were they willing to set adrift the aged and helpless,"<sup>10</sup> and in many instances they were deeply attached to them. As early as 1828, Gerard C. Brandon, the first native governor, realized slavery to be an incubus, and in his annual message said:<sup>11</sup> "Slavery is an evil at best, and has invariably operated oppressively on the poorer class of every community into which it has been introduced, by destroying that mutual dependence which would otherwise exist between the rich and the poor, and excludes from the state, in proportion to the number of slaves, a free white population through the means of which alone can we expect to take rank with our sister states." And again on the general subject of conditions, S. S. Prentiss of Natchez, Mississippi, wrote in 1831:<sup>12</sup> "To free the slaves,

---

<sup>9</sup> A Defence of Negro Slavery as It Exists in the United States, p. 157.

<sup>10</sup> A Southern Planter, Smedes, p. 149.

<sup>11</sup> Mississippi (an encyclopædia), by Dunbar Rowland, Southern Historical Publishing Association, Vol. II, p. 684. 1907. (See also Claiborne's Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State.)

<sup>12</sup> Mississippi (an encyclopædia), by Dunbar Rowland, Vol. II, p. 688.

and let them continue in the United States, would not, in my opinion, be any advantage to them; though if they could be transported to Africa again, it would be better. But it is impossible on account of their number—and even if they were all offered the privilege of going to Africa, I do not believe half of them would accept it. The sin of the business lies at the door of those who first introduced slavery into this country. The evil is now too deep-rooted to be eradicated." Indeed, the legislature of Mississippi found it necessary to prevent the manumission of negroes who were to remain in the state, since a class between the slave and the owner made too discordant an element to be endured. The master disposed to free his slaves was thus compelled either to take them to the free states or send them to Africa. There was a growing feeling in favor of colonization, and instances are recorded of planters who went to great expense to transport their slaves across the ocean. In the early thirties, Judge Green of Adams County, Mississippi, emancipated by will one hundred and fifty negroes, "provided for their transportation, with one year's provisions and medicines and a full supply of agricultural implements." "His will," adds Claiborne, the historian, "was faithfully carried out by his heirs-at-law, who were large slaveholders."<sup>13</sup> But for those who were unable to send their slaves to Africa, the only practical mode was to carry them beyond the state limits, emancipate, and leave them. Should the black man ever afterward be found in the state, he forfeited his freedom and was sold.

But to this was added another difficulty. As the number of free negroes increased in the non-slaveholding states, especially in the new states north of the Ohio, strict laws were passed against them. Indiana not only passed stringent laws preventing the entrance of negroes into her territory but also compelling "the early expatriation of those now (1851) resident on her soil."<sup>14</sup> Various other states, as Illinois, Iowa, and Delaware, passed discriminating laws against free negroes who wished to

---

<sup>13</sup> Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State, by Claiborne, Vol. I, p. 388.

<sup>14</sup> *De Bow's Review*, Dec. 1851—"Equality of the Races," by John Campbell, of Philadelphia.

become citizens.<sup>15</sup> These "Black Laws," as they were termed, required negroes to file certificates of freedom rigidly excluding them from the militia and from the public schools, and "no negro could testify against a white man." Thus many believed that emancipation, which set the thriftless and irresponsible negro adrift in an unwelcome community, was no kind service to him. In spite of the southern zeal for universal liberty, these men in truth and in sincerity believed slavery to be a boon to the African.

But those masters who viewed the institution in this light were the noble, fine-hearted men who made the interests of humanity their own and whose slaves usually came to them through inheritance. "It is true that the relations between the slaves and the families of their owners were frequently of such a character that no art, power, or persuasion could have been sufficiently potent to scatter their slaves or disrupt the family circles."<sup>16</sup> Many trustworthy instances could be cited where masters emphatically refused to sell unless the purchaser was willing to take whole families. A New Englander who visited the South for the purpose of finding out conditions reports a conversation which he held with a trader who transported slaves from Washington and Alexandria to the Natchez market. I quote from his book: "In one instance he [the trader] remarked, they had purchased from one estate more than fifty negroes in order to prevent the separation of family connections; and in selling them, they had been equally scrupulous to have them continue together. In this case, however, they had sacrificed not less than one or two thousand dollars, which they might have obtained by separating them, as they would have sold much better in smaller lots."<sup>17</sup> "Owners frequently refused

---

<sup>15</sup> Even to-day, I am told by a resident of Cass County, Illinois, that there is such a strong feeling against them, that though there is no constitutional warrant for it, when a negro enters the county he is made to understand he had better get out within three days.

<sup>16</sup> *Slavery and Slave-trade in the United States*, by Ethan Allen Andrews, 1836, p. 139.

<sup>17</sup> *The Legal Status of Slaves in Mississippi before the War*, by W. W. Magruder (Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society, Vol. IV, p. 141).

to sell negroes so as to part sisters attached to each other; but negroes related frequently preferred to be sold to different owners, so that they might have pretexts for visits."<sup>18</sup>

But that there were cruel cases of separation cannot be passed over. To quote again from the New England author in a conversation with another trader:<sup>19</sup> "In selling slaves, Mr. N. assures me that he never separates families, but in purchasing them he is often compelled to do so, for that his business is to purchase, and must take such as are in the market. 'Do you often buy a wife without the husband?' 'Yes, very often, and frequently, too, they sell me the mother while they keep her children. Children from one to eighteen months old are worth about one hundred dollars. That fellow,' pointing to one about eighteen, 'I gave seven hundred and fifty for last night.'"

It was the report of the cruel features of the slave-trade that did most to anger abolitionists against the institution and bring about the final emancipation of the slave. In addition to this phase and the cruelty of a few tyrannical masters, who invariably lost social caste in their community, the "overseer" feature of slavery must be reckoned with. In Mississippi and other states of the River Basin, large "gangs of slaves" were under the charge of an overseer, who was instructed to make as large crops as possible.<sup>20</sup> Sometimes the planter resided at a distance and did not interfere with the authority of the overseer. In many instances the overseer was the most exacting and vindictive of rulers and converted an otherwise mild and obedient slave into "an obstinate, reckless rebel, fearing nothing, feeling nothing and caring for nothing."

"But," asks the inquirer, "were there no laws curbing the power of a cruel master or overseer and allowing the slave to appeal to the court?" In the first constitution adopted by the state, August 15, 1817, we find a clause<sup>21</sup> "which provided that the Legislature might establish in each county a Court of Pro-

<sup>18</sup> Mississippi (an encyclopædia), by Dunbar Rowland, Vol. II, p. 691.

<sup>19</sup> Slavery and the Slave-trade in the United States, by E. A. Andrews, p. 147.

<sup>20</sup> Slavery and the Internal Slave Trade in the United States, p. 76. London: Thomas Ward & Co. 1841.

<sup>21</sup> Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society, Vol. II, p. 135.

bate, for the discharge of various enumerated functions and 'for the trial of slaves.'" This constitution also provided that "the Legislature should never have the power to deprive the slave of the right to an impartial trial by jury." Killing a slave was punishable with death in all the cotton-planting states. An instance is cited, 1846, by a resident of Lowndes County, Mississippi, of a wealthy man of the county who forfeited his bond of \$20,000 and fled the country rather than stand his trial for murdering one of his slaves, "though," adds the writer, "the proof was not conclusive that the murder was wantonly committed."<sup>22</sup>

Further on in this same constitution we find that the Legislature is empowered to pass laws to oblige the owners of slaves "to treat them with humanity, to provide for them necessary clothing and provisions, to abstain from all injuries to them extending to life or limb." An avowed upholder of slavery<sup>23</sup> complains to his own people that "the negro houses in general are too small, too open for health." Some claim that the clothing of the slaves was wretchedly poor in Lower Mississippi and Louisiana and that the farther south in these states you go, the worse the conditions.<sup>24</sup> Also by later enactments, cruel and unusual punishments inflicted on slaves were forbidden by law.<sup>25</sup> When these laws were broken, the legislature had the power to sell the slave to a more humane master.

Some of the specific laws that were passed in these early days appear to us as most harsh and extreme. For a slave to "use abusive or provoking language to, or lift his hand in opposition to a white person," was an offence punishable with a maximum of thirty-nine lashes, according to the discretion of the owner. Yet no punishment was to be inflicted where it appeared to the justice that he was acting in self-defence. "The punishment varied all the way from ten stripes 'for presuming to come upon

<sup>22</sup> A Defence of Negro Slavery as It Exists in the United States, by Matthew Estes, p. 125. 1846.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., p. 254.

<sup>24</sup> Slavery and the Internal Slave Trade in the United States, p. 97. London: Thomas Ware & Co. 1841.

<sup>25</sup> Southern Slave Laws, Abstract of the Laws of Mississippi, by Alexander Clayton — *De Bow's Review*, Vol. VIII, p. 23.

the plantation of any person without leave from his master,' up to thirty-nine for grand and petty larceny" and in almost every case these lashes were to be "well laid on." Yet the negro was often whipped and turned loose for offences for which a white man would be imprisoned. "There was a white man not long since," says Estes,<sup>26</sup> "sent to the Mississippi penitentiary for stealing three dollars. He lay in jail several months before his trial came on, and was then found guilty and sentenced to the penitentiary for several years. I knew a slave in this very town taken up and whipped, then turned loose, for stealing a considerable amount of money. I could, were it necessary, give any number of such cases. The young man alluded to will never recover his lost character, but will ever feel the scorn, contempt and neglect of society. The negro is still in our community, and has not sustained the slightest loss of character that I am aware of. He looks as cheerful, sleek, and lively as ever."

For the graver offences, some of the punishments seem to us now extremely crude. But as Stone points out,<sup>27</sup> "we must not lose sight of the times in which they were effective." They "looked upon the criminal laws from a view-point radically different from that of to-day. The debtor's prison still existed in England,—the stocks and pillory were instruments of common use here and there,—the public whipping-post claimed its daily victims." In regard to the penalty for perjury, which was more severe than any other non-capital offences, no oath whatever was administered, but the witness was charged to speak the truth and the punishment for failure to do so was announced in clear terms before he gave his testimony,<sup>28</sup> "and if it be found hereafter that you tell a lie, and give false testimony in this matter, you must, for so doing, have both your ears nailed to the pillory, and cut off, and receive thirty-nine lashes on your bare back, well laid on, at the common whipping-post." "It did not conclude 'So help you God'." But it is of conse-

---

<sup>26</sup> *A Defence of Negro Slavery as It Exists in the United States*, by Matthew Estes, 1846, p. 125.

<sup>27</sup> *The Early Slave Laws in Mississippi*, by A. H. Stone (in *Publications of the Mississippi Historical Society*, Vol. I, p. 136). <sup>28</sup> *Ibid.* p. 140.

quence to know that we can find no record to show that the punishment was ever resorted to.

Many of the minor laws, such as those forbidding a slave to keep dogs or stock or to cultivate a patch of cotton or corn for his own use, were popularly decreed unnecessary and severe, and were frequently disregarded.<sup>29</sup> We find many references to this. The slaves "are often allowed to raise hogs for themselves, and every thrifty slave has his pig pen and poultry house. Each family is allowed a plot of ground and the use of a team, for melons, potatoes, etc. In the cotton picking season all that they gather over the usual task of seventy-five or eighty pounds a day, they are rewarded for."<sup>30</sup> And another writer cites the instance "of a tall and lithe young woman" who was the best cotton picker at B——. "At Christmas, Nelly's share of the prize money was something over seventeen dollars."<sup>31</sup>

Besides these incentives to good work, the slaves were looked after in a moral and religious way. Selling liquor to them was a misdemeanor severely punished, and many a master could pride himself on never having a drunkard on his plantation. Trading on Sunday, for white man or black, was strictly forbidden by law. Places of public worship were provided in almost every community, and there an ordained white minister preached to them. The law forbade negroes to preach, except on their master's plantation with his consent. In many of the towns and communities, Sunday Schools were opened for them where they were freely taught.

Indeed, "a Southern Plantation, well managed, had nearly everything necessary to life done within its bounds."<sup>32</sup> There were the tanners and the shoemakers, the blacksmiths, the carpenters, and the miller. In and about the house and the out-of-door kitchen, worked the house-servants, the seamstresses, the laundry-woman, the cook and little "darkies to do the chores." These busy workers prepared the meals and made the clothes for the numerous field-hands. The houses of these

---

<sup>29</sup> *DeBow's Review*, Dec. 1851, *Slave Laws of the Southern States—Mississippi*, by Col. H. W. Walter, Vol. XI, p. 620.

<sup>30</sup> Claiborne's *Mississippi as a Province, Territory and State*, p. 144.

<sup>31</sup> *A Southern Planter*, by S. D. Smedes, p. 32.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* p. 47.

cotton pickers "were arranged on streets leading from the overseer's house as a common center." "Every house," writes Dunbar Rowland,<sup>33</sup> "had a large front room and a small shed room. The slave family always had a garden spot given for their own. They were taught the pride of ownership, and many families beautified their little homes with running vines and flowers. Their food was issued to them weekly from a big 'smoke-house' that was to be found on every Mississippi plantation. It was plain, wholesome, and substantial, and consisted of bread, meat, rice, and vegetables, molasses and milk." This writer on plantation life in Mississippi plainly evinces in his article that his sole purpose is to give a fair and truthful account of slavery as it existed in the state of Mississippi.

"It is admitted now that the state of servitude upon which the labor system of the South rested before the war had much in it that was cruel, revolting and oppressive, and it is also true that it had far more that was humane, generous, loving and sympathetic."<sup>34</sup> There was genuine truth in the saying current in Mississippi and elsewhere, "that the mistress of a plantation was the most complete slave on it."<sup>35</sup> The master, too, as a rule, was humane and sympathetic and was one of the most princely of men in adversity as well as in prosperity. Those not familiar with accounts of beneficent plantation life such as the world can never see again would do well to read Mrs. Smedes's *A Southern Planter*; for, to quote Gladstone's words, "It teaches a lesson, always useful, of caution to be observed, and of justice to be rendered, in passing judgment on the character, whether of an individual or of a class, which has had the misfortune to stand in association with a system justly condemned."

RUTH B. HAWES.

Charlottesville, Virginia.

---

<sup>33</sup> Plantation Life in Mississippi before the War (in Mississippi Historical Society Publications, Vol. III, p. 90).

<sup>34</sup> Ibid. p. 85.

<sup>35</sup> *A Southern Planter*, by S. D. Smedes, p. 150.

## BENVENUTO CELLINI: THE MAN AND HIS ART

Pleasantly confident that he is one of the greatest men and artists who ever lived, Benvenuto Cellini,—goldsmith, sculptor, and writer, —dictates to his amanuensis the story of his life as he chisels away at a statue for the Grand Duke. This autobiography, one of the most fascinating in existence, divides itself into three parts,—his life in Italy from his birth in the year 1500 up to the age of forty, his five years in France, and the remainder of his life in Florence.

The first, which occupies a good half of the book, is the most interesting of the three, from the picture it gives of his own personality and the interesting glimpses of the manners of the time, although from an artistic standpoint these years of his life are comparatively unimportant. But it is a fascinating picture,—this of the artist life in Rome and Florence amid the polished rudeness of an awakening people, full of enthusiasm, vivacity, and simple credulity, all seen through the eyes of a man in full sympathy with it, keenly alive and on the alert for everything life had to offer, a man of violent passions, hot-headed, sensual, yet with a mind and eye eager for the finest things, a man who breathes the spirit of that most fascinating of all periods in history, the Italian Renaissance.

It is the story of a life guided entirely by two motives. The first and most important is his overwhelming egoism. To call him conceited is to offer him almost an insult. It ceases to be conceit, it is a conviction on his part that he is one of the greatest men if not the greatest man who will ever adorn the pages of history. The tone of the whole book is struck on the first page. He tells us that "Julius Cæsar had among his captains a man of highest rank and valor who was called Fiorino of Cellino." The soldiers who went to see him referred to his quarters at the foot of the hill of Fiesole as "Fiorenze, as well because the said captain was called Fiorino as because the place he had chosen for his quarters was very rich in flowers." Whereupon Cæsar, in order to compliment his captain called the place Florence, and so it has continued. Thus Cellini

smilingly assures us that his native city is named after an illustrious member of his family. And *sic esto perpetua* is the tone of all that follows: let many great and excellent things take their titles from Benvenuto Cellini, more illustrious still. He goes on to say that at his birth and during his childhood several strange portents and miracles were seen. Such things are usual at the birth and childhood of demi-gods.

The other guiding motive of his life is a passionate, intense worship of beauty. Made less effectual by his egoism, falsified by misunderstanding and by a feverish desire for praise, it still burns through all his life. And in many ways it covers a multitude of his sins. Cellini honestly worked to make his art beautiful, and never set about creating anything which he thought beforehand would be ugly or graceless,—not from any moral sense, to be sure, but because the thought of it was intolerable. This quality must be taken at its face value, such as that is. Try to idealize it, and show that his worship of beauty was the cause or effect of a like quality in his life, and you run hopelessly off the track. It was an unphilosophic and unmoral force, but a force, nevertheless, that he neither cared to nor could put down.

As he found no moral inspiration in the work which was his life, so he found little elsewhere. Judged even by the lax standards of his time, his conduct was often reprehensible, to say the least, and since he had as little caution as moral restraint his hasty passions often got him into trouble. Molinier tries to defend his homicides on the ground of these low standards and sagely remarks, "au sixième siècle c'est le seul moyen de se faire respecter." It seems to me that the excellent Frenchman might have spared himself the trouble. Cellini was a man for whom the moral aspect of things seems to have no interest or appeal whatever.

The early part of his life was spent in Rome and Florence, wherever he found shops offering the best employ, or later, wherever he found the most appreciative and generous patrons. Pope Clement VII took a strong fancy to him, both on account of his work and for the aid he had given during the siege of the city. Accordingly he lived in Rome in peace and prosperity

for some time. But with the death of Clement VII and the accession of Paul III, Rome no longer smiled on him. Clement, he tells us, had once said privately to a friend, "He is the greatest artist who was ever born in his own craft. Some day when we are together I will show you some of his marvelous works." (Cellini neglects to mention just how he learned of this interview.) Paul, however, spurred on by his illegitimate son Luigi, had thrown the erstwhile favorite into prison on an apparently false charge of stealing some of the papal jewels from Clement. Escaping after three years confinement he was glad enough to avail himself of the influence of Francis I and Cardinal Ferrara in his behalf, and to accept their invitation to come to France, where he established himself in 1540. He was to receive for his work a salary of seven hundred crowns a year, the same salary as had once been paid to Leonardo da Vinci.

His work up to that time had been entirely limited to that of the goldsmith,—coins, medals, seals, and jewelry. A coin made for Clement is a rather mediocre affair, but something of an advance over the prevalent styles of coinage at that day. A seal made for Cardinal Gonzagua in 1528 shows his style in embryo. The figures, which represent the Assumption of the Virgin, are spaced with an artistic symmetry, though crowded and confused in the style of the sixteenth century, which filled every available space on its decorative bas-reliefs, allowing the eye no place to rest. The theatrical attitudes of the Apostles who stand grouped around the tomb from which the Virgin has just ascended, show a rather unhappy imitation of Michelangelo, which persists in Cellini's later work. A medal designed for Cardinal Bembo shows greater promise than either of these two. On the obverse is the profile of the Cardinal with a full flowing beard, splendidly done. The reverse has a rather clumsy figure of Pegasus.

His five years in France are marked by three important productions, the nymph of Fontainebleau, the gold salt-cellar, and the Jupiter. Cellini considered the last his best work at this period, a fact which makes its loss particularly unfortunate.

The semicircular bas-relief of the nymph was made to go

over the door of the palace at Fontainebleau, Francis's favorite residence. The nude figure of the nymph reclines with one arm about the neck of a stag, while several other animals symbolical of the chase are grouped in the upper part of the piece. The figures are crowded, the face of the nymph is expressionless, her legs are unnaturally long, and the whole composition is marred by poor drawing and a lack of unity. In short, the goldsmith is trying to be a sculptor, and making a fiasco of it. In the sixteenth century the goldsmith's and sculptor's trades were practically distinct. Cellini was a born goldsmith, and his attempts to rise to sculpture were, with a few exceptions, unhappy failures.

The other extant work from this period, the gold salt-cellar of the Vienna museum, shows him more in his proper sphere. This was finished for Francis I after a model made at Rome in 1540 for Cardinal Ferrara. Two nude figures, one of Neptune and the other a female figure of the Earth, are seated above a crowd of dolphins and other sea-animals, which peer out from the edges of a sloping sea. The figures are too large for the rest of the composition, and the attitude of the Earth is somewhat stiff, but the general effect is quite graceful. The exaggerated modeling of the muscles (a fault which appears even more glaringly in the finished Perseus) is again the sign of the uncomprehending imitation of Michelangelo.

After five years in France Cellini's popularity began to wane. Madame d' Etampes, the royal mistress, had taken a dislike to him, and, if his own account is to be believed, used her influence in such a way that his life became not only unpleasant but unsafe. At all events he obtained permission to leave France and returned to Florence, where he took service under the Duke Cosimo I, of the Medici.

Very soon after his arrival he began work on the best known of his statues, Perseus with the head of Medusa, now in the Loggia dei Lanzi at Florence. It represents Perseus in the moment of victory, standing nude, holding his sword in his right hand and with his left lifting up the head of Medusa, on whose prostrate and contorted body he stands. The idea of the statue is a common one, a mythological subject symbolically treated to repre-

sent a political ideal. The changing fortunes of Italian states during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance period made such subjects extremely popular.

The student of the Perseus is particularly lucky in having the wax model at hand as well as the finished statue, and in addition to these a bronze cast, in the Florentine National Museum, which seems to have been made after the model and before the final figure. There was at one time some doubt whether this intermediate cast was the work of Cellini, but the identity of its pose and treatment with those of the wax model has led modern critics to ascribe it to him unanimously. Taken as a whole it is a far better piece of work than the finished statue. It seems to have been executed when the first flush of inspiration was upon the artist. The general simplicity of treatment, the lithe and graceful pose of the body, the balance of the head and head-dress with the rest of the figure, and, best of all, the chastened refinement in the modeling of the muscles are characteristics of this bronze cast which the statue in the Loggia dei Lanzi lacks. Cellini apparently reflected, studied, and made measurements before going on to complete his work. Measurements show that the arms in the bronze cast are too long; in the finished statue they have been shortened. Some critics have condemned the straight line which the raised left arm and the upper part of the right arm form, urging that they give the suggestion of a rapidly revolving windmill, photographed as it turns. I am inclined to disagree with this criticism, but Cellini apparently decided that the position was a bad one, and lowered the left arm to break this line. Whatever one may think of these two changes, the others which have been made are indisputably for the worse. The muscles have been made out of all proportion to the size of the body, and the head-dress has been elaborated until it threatens to topple over, bearing the rest of the figure with it. The abnormal position of the prostrate body of Medusa on which the hero stands has not been improved from the bronze cast, and the blood pouring from her neck has an even more hairy appearance.

Nowhere else in all Cellini's work is the suicidal effect of his imitation of Michelangelo better shown than in the finished

Perseus. The piece is cold, and lacks all of Michelangelo's grandeur as well as his restraint. The school which imitated him shared the failing of all purely imitative schools, they could not see that heroic works can be produced only by heroic conceptions. They could not see that "style is but the expression of the man" and fondly thought that by carefully modeling every muscle and curve in the human body, they could become Michelangelos without troubling themselves to look for the spirit that taught him to model thus.

The base of the statue is too long for the figure and too highly ornamented for its purpose. This elaborate ornamentation, like that on Perseus's cap, is another example of the goldsmith intruding himself upon the sculptor's domain. The four figures with which the base is decorated are still more Michelangesque than the Perseus and, for the most part, of no value. The Minerva and Danaë are without grace and overmodeled. The Mercury, poised on one foot with his hands raised and head turned to one side, is quite prettily conceived but poorly executed. The Jupiter is the most interesting of the four, since from it one may guess at the plan of the colossal Jupiter made in Paris for Francis I. Unfortunately it is very disappointing. The god, with a toga hanging from his shoulder, raises one arm ostensibly to hurl a thunderbolt. Cellini has tried to make it very impressive and has succeeded only in making it rather absurd. This figure serves to illustrate a curious ignorance on Cellini's part of a relationship in the human body. It is a commonplace of figure drawing that when one shoulder is raised, the hip on the other side of the body is also raised slightly, and the whole figure takes on a sort of a double curve, as in the Venus of Milo. This relationship Cellini apparently did not understand, and his Jupiter stands with level hips while his up-raised arm lifts one shoulder considerably above the other.

Another figure in which the same misunderstanding is shown, though it is not so noticeable, is the Ganymede of the Affigi Museum. This simple and graceful statuette is, however, an attractive contrast to the deities at the base of the Perseus, and shows that Cellini was at his best when he worked without care for magnificent or heroic results.

A bust of the Duke, executed soon after the completion of the Perseus, is the best example of Cellini's work in portrait sculpture, a branch of his art in which he essayed very little. The figure is dignified and well-moulded, but the treatment of the bronze with gilt and polychrome is more suited to goldsmith's work than to sculpture, where it gives a decidedly bizarre effect. The heroic aspect seems to be a bit of flattery; it is better suited to the artist than his model.

It was as a goldsmith, however, that we see Cellini in his element, not rising above the faults of his time, but excelling in its virtues. The gilded silver pitcher and the decorated gold flasks of the Pitti palace and the bronze vase of the Corsini gallery, three of his best productions in this line, are all worked with a profuse richness but in perfect taste. The figures are placed with a decorative symmetry, though closely crowded, and are elegantly and delicately worked. In the reliefs the overcrowding is worse, with the result that one usually fails to distinguish individual figures in the solid ripples of silver.

The best example of Cellini's merits, and the best piece by which to point out his faults, conspicuous by their absence, is the bronze bas-relief of a dog, in the National Museum. He tells us that this cast was made while he was working on the Perseus in order to give him experience in working with bronze. Accordingly he had no reputation to sustain, no Michelangelo to imitate, no Duke to satisfy; he worked here for the joy of creation, and the result is a beautiful, unaffected, unexaggerated figure. This bas-relief I must consider his best work. The grace of the underline of the greyhound's body, the fine treatment of the ribs and the lower hind legs, and most of all the exquisite moulding of the head, slightly raised in relief, put this figure above anything else he made. The background is plain, probably more by good luck than good management, for we should expect a litter of puppies, and an array of rags and bones piled together pell-mell, with St. Christopher Cynocephalus presiding over all.

An interesting comparison can be made between this relief and Pisanello's Study of a Dog, executed about one hundred years before Cellini's day. This is a drawing by a man who

knew and loved dogs. He has caught the rugged fineness of the Danish hound admirably, and in the anatomical treatment he shows more familiarity with his subject than does Cellini, who seems to have been troubled in the management of the clavicle and the upper hind leg. But Pisanello's drawing, for all its correctness, lacks the subtle grace and affection that Cellini has expressed so beautifully.

Here as elsewhere, he is at his best when taken off his guard, most immortal when he least thought to be. And perhaps it is for the same reason that to-day he is less known as the sculptor of the Perseus and the Nymph of Fontainebleau than as the author of the thoughtlessly told autobiography.

GERALD JACKSON PYLE

Wilmington, Delaware.

### THREE BOOKS ON NORTHERN ITALY\*

The cities of Northern Italy are too much neglected by the tourist. Ordinarily, after visiting the lakes he stays at Milan for a day to see the cathedral and perhaps the Brera and Leonardo's Last Supper, and then hurries on to Venice, occasionally stopping at Verona in memory of Romeo and Juliet. This is a great mistake, for the cities of Lombardy and Venetia are full of interest and charm. Hidden among the modern splendors of Milan are numberless old and beautiful things that no one should neglect. Padua is a perfect treasury of art, rich in master-works from the time of Giotto to the days of art's decline. Bergamo upon its hill-top, with its stately modern suburbs at its feet, is one of the most delightful places, combining the charms of the picturesque hill-set cities of Tuscany and Umbria with the spaciousness of the North. Brescia, rich in works of Moretto; stately Vicenza, where Palladio has everywhere left his mark; Mantua, haunted by the memories of Isabella d' Este; Pavia, long the seat of the empire; Parma, made radiantly beautiful by the genius of Correggio; Modena with its splendid Campanile; Cremona, with its great cathedral; Castelfranco with its lovely Giorgione; Undine with its exquisite town hall; Treviso with its fine Titian; and many a small place,—are deserving not merely of a visit, but of a prolonged study.

The most striking peculiarity of these North Italian towns is their spaciousness. Instead of the narrow and tortuous streets of the cities of Central and Southern Italy, we have wide thoroughfares stretching out straight into the distance, or curving gracefully to delight the eye. Not crowded upon a hill-top nor compressed into a valley, but free to expand over the limitless and fertile plains, the cities have spread out, giving us at every turn beautiful vistas down wide avenues lined with noble palaces. These cities are splendidly built; for the inexhaustible fertility of the soil has from time immemorial poured into their

---

\* *Venice and Venetia*, and *The Cities of Lombardy*, by Edward Hutton (Macmillan); and *Plain Towns of Italy*, by Egerton R. Williams, Jr. (Houghton-Mifflin Co.)

laps a ceaseless stream of treasure, which has been expended in the erection of grand churches and princely mansions and in adorning them with all the treasures of art.

It is, therefore, a joy and a privilege to possess these three books, written with a profound knowledge and with a befitting enthusiasm. Both Mr. Hutton and Mr. Williams are worthy of praise; but two men could hardly be more different.

Mr. Hutton, whose *Cities of Spain* is perhaps the most exquisite piece of prose written in English since the death of Pater, is a delightful stylist, choosing his words with impeccable taste, and weaving his sentences with an artist's skill. He is a passionate lover of the old, a *laudator temporis peracti*, who looks upon the Middle Ages as the most glorious of human eras, and esteems all that is modern as base and ugly. We must take him with his limitations, accepting gratefully his refined perception of the beauty that is in old things on which the hand of Time has been laid with caressing touch, and smiling with incredulity when we read his denunciation of the modern world and all its works. He is a Catholic such as there are few on earth to-day, esteeming the mediæval darkness the most splendid epoch of history, because then the church ruled with unquestioned sway and saints were to be found at every cross-road. He looks upon the Inquisition as a necessary and beneficent institution that should be revived, saying, for example (*Cities of Lombardy*, p. 135), "Even the most unclerical among us will be compelled to think of such a man as St. Peter Martyr, of such an institution as the Inquisition, as a necessity to the sanity of the world, and after all on the side of sweetness and light." The saint in question, whose chief title to fame is the vast number of heretics he burnt, is a great favorite with Mr. Hutton, who sings his praises again and again; and the cruel persecution of heretics, which most people consider the one stain on the bright name of San Carlo Borromeo, is, in Mr. Hutton's eyes, his highest crown. But his views find their most remarkable expression in this amazing passage from the same work (p. 303):—

"At Canossa everything was ready for an attack. Azzo d' Este was there and Hugh, Abbot of Clugny, and over

them all the great Countess. Uplifted before all Europe, the Emperor and the Pope faced one another to decide who should be master.

"Henry came. Was it the mountains that had broken him, or the astonishment of Italy, or the hand of God? Whatever it was, he was broken. His first act was to beg intercession from Matilda, who with Hugh the Abbot met him when he begged it at Bianello. The Countess, who was his cousin, undertook to plead his cause.

"Then Hildebrand said: 'If Henry is indeed repentant, let him lay down crown and scepter, and declare that he is unworthy of the name of a king.'

"There spoke the soul of Europe that cannot be broken.

"Henry did as he was ordered. It was the end of January; the earth was covered with snow, the streams were silent with frost. In the thin garb of a penitent, in a shirt of white linen, the successor of the Cæsars, nay Cæsar himself, slowly climbed the rocky path to the outer gate of Canossa. And they all looked upon him as he stood before the closed inner gate. There, in the bitter weather, he waited fasting for three days and three nights. On the fourth day, half dead with cold, the wretched Emperor was brought into the presence of God's Vicegerent. He prostrated himself in the dust, crying for pardon. Then Hildebrand placed his foot upon the Emperor's neck and spoke: 'Super aspidem et basiliscum ambulabis et conculcabis leonem et draconem': Thou shalt tread upon the lion and the adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under thy feet.

"After this Gregory said Mass and permitted Henry to receive the Blessed Sacrament.

"That scene will live forever in the mind of man, for it is the most perfect expression of the Europe out of which we are come and to which we shall return. Canossa is its monument, a place worthier of pilgrimage by us who are European than ever was Becket's tomb at Canterbury, holy though that was and famous through the world. Canossa was a bigger victory than Canterbury, and Italy a bigger stage than England."

We had not supposed that there was a man living who entertained such sentiments, unless perhaps in some remote Spanish monastery. Their expression does much injury, and, we believe, much injustice, to the great church of which Mr. Hutton is so devout a member.

Considering Mr. Hutton's vast knowledge of things Italian, one statement in the book is hard to understand. He repeats without question Vasari's assertion that Leonardo's Last Supper was painted in oil, and he makes no reference to the work of the Cavaliere Cavenaghi, who has so marvelously restored that decaying masterpiece, smoothing out with infinite patience each curling fragment of paint, and gluing it back upon the wall, so as to preserve for us every atom that remains of the precious masterpiece. Sig. Cavenaghi discovered that the medium employed was tempera; and it was that knowledge which enabled him to accomplish his splendid task.

Mr. Williams's book is in marked contrast with Mr. Hutton's in every way. The latter is an Englishman, brought up in the stylistic and æsthetic atmosphere of Oxford, though never a student there. Mr. Williams, on the other hand, is an American, clear-eyed and modern in his outlook, loving the beautiful old things with his whole heart, but appreciating all the advantages and improvements of the modern world. His is a matchless guide to the portion of Italy with which it deals, full of information on all topics, appreciative of every worthy form of art of whatever age. It is not the impression of a hasty tourist, but the result of the mature studies of a thoroughly equipped man, who has taken the time to see and to understand. Only in one respect does he fall below his English rival—his style, while straight-forward, lucid, and readable, has not the magic cadences that Mr. Hutton weaves so deftly.

All three are books which the traveller in Northern Italy should take with him, more accurate and far more informing than any regular guide. Mr. Hutton's, printed upon that strangely light paper of which the English possess the secret, can easily be carried about; but Mr. Williams's fine work, the ideal guide-book for the wanderer in Northern Italy, is upon our heavy American paper, and its weight is a sad drawback to the discreet traveller who longs to carry it in his hand on that delightful pilgrimage.

GEORGE B. ROSE.

Little Rock, Arkansas.

## BOOK REVIEWS

THE HAMLET PROBLEM AND ITS SOLUTION. By Emerson Venable.  
Cincinnati: Stewart & Kidd Co. 1912.

The solution here presented may be described as a variant on that theory which considers Hamlet's delay due to the scruples of conscience, and on that particular form of this theory which supposes these scruples to be subconscious. The originality of the present solution consists in supposing that Hamlet first regards the ghost's command to imply a purely personal vengeance, against which his moral nature instinctively though unconsciously rebels, and that later he comes gradually to realize that the command also contains a larger ethical purpose, by means of which the time, which is out of joint, shall, by his killing of Claudius, be set right. Moreover, the author sees in the drama a universal application which makes Hamlet's upward struggle symbolic of the moral struggle of humanity as a whole.

To accept this solution one must take an altogether unwarranted view of most of Hamlet's words, and one must explain the absence of any words stating the fact that, after being withheld by subconscious moral scruples, he begins to feel later that the killing of the king is a part of the divine purpose. Hamlet, of course, again and again questions the reason of his own delay and eagerly looks for any possible excuse, but nowhere does he suggest the possibility of such excuse in the wrongfulness of the deed itself. The only words which could be construed to suggest this are those addressed to Horatio (V. ii. 67): "Is't not perfect conscience to quit him with this arm?" Mr. Venable concludes his study with a consideration of this passage, but what is most surprising is that he ignores the discussion of the bearing of this passage upon the conscience theory by Bradley (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, pages 98, 99), although Bradley's well-known work is elsewhere quoted and praised.

Still more surprising is the author's neglect of Bradley's discussion of the word 'conscience' in the soliloquy concerning

suicide (III. i. 56). The word as here used is taken by Bradley and other critics to be equivalent to 'thought', and is so defined in Schmidt's *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, but the present author tacitly assumes it to possess the modern sense. Assuming this, he finds in the soliloquy an expression of Hamlet's sense of the immanence of divine law, and proceeds to elaborate the vague "dread of something after death" into a purely moral objection to suicide. In passing, it is worth noting that the First Quarto, which probably shows Shakespeare's earlier conceptions, makes more specific reference to orthodox ideas of another world when the dead are "borne before an everlasting judge", and where "the happy smile and the accursed are damned." If Shakespeare had regarded Hamlet as does Mr. Venable he would scarcely have eliminated these words.

One effect of the present solution is to minimize the lethargic character of Hamlet's delay. Mr. Venable incidentally mentions the time supposed to have elapsed between acts one and two as "measured by days rather than hours." But the commonly accepted time analysis of the play measures it by months—one or perhaps two. Yet through all this delay, filled as we feel sure both with "bestial oblivion" and "thinking too precisely on the event", through all this we must suppose an energetic character restrained by a moral scruple powerful enough to nullify the ghost's command and yet not obvious enough to be discovered by the self-observed of all self-observers. A striking example of the necessity of twisting the meaning of a passage to suit the author's purpose is seen in the comments on the soliloquy in act four, scene four. Here we are told, "Hamlet is now far removed, mentally and spiritually, from any impulsive act of mere personal revenge,—notwithstanding the final exclamatory words of vain resolve with which he essays to revive a dying purpose." Those words, it may be recalled, are:—

"O, from this time forth,  
My thoughts be bloody, or be nothing worth."

The climax of the play is, according to this theory, at the killing of Polonius. After this the Personal yields to the Impersonal motive until, in the philosophical utterance made to Horatio in act five, we see Hamlet's mind "now serene—his will no

longer in opposition to the will of Heaven." But surely, for one who has gradually come to see that the will of Heaven is for him to kill the King and is inspired by this thought, Hamlet continues to proceed on his mission in a remarkably dilatory manner, and finally stumbles into its accomplishment most fortuitously.

Although unconvincing, this study is well written and ingeniously constructed, and its reading will prove stimulating to all interested in the supreme figure of all fiction. But it is not a solution. The author's desire to find good in everything in Hamlet's character is only less misleading than Churton Collins's effort to see all that is vile in the same object. Surely that most interesting of things, the problematic character, is neither entirely the one nor the other. The final interest in Hamlet is not one of ethics but of personality. And there can no more be a solution of a personality than there can be a solution of a sunset or an amoeba. There will never be a solution of Hamlet, although there will be in the future, as there has been in the past, an increased appreciation. Since this is so, it might be suggested that, as the Patent Office keeps a printed form giving the reasons for the impossibility of the discovery of Perpetual Motion, so it would be well to have conspicuously hung in all publishing houses a statement explaining the insolubility of the Hamlet Problem.

L. WARDLAW MILES.

---

A HISTORY OF FRENCH LITERATURE. By C. H. Conrad Wright, of Harvard University. 8vo. pp. 964 + xiv. New York and London: Oxford University Press, American Branch.

This is the opening volume in a great series of French texts and criticisms of French literature which has been projected by the American Branch of the Oxford University Press. The series is under the general editorship of Professor Raymond Weeks, of Columbia University. Our readers are perhaps already familiar with the similar collection issued by this publishing house, called the Oxford German Series, which has been in successful operation for three or four years.

In this large and comprehensive work Professor Wright has put a capstone to a high reputation won as an editor of numer-

ous French classics. He has essayed truly a herculean task — or shall we say, a protean? In this day of specialization in all things, it is a brave man who confronts the critics with a general history of a literature, written primarily for the serious student, but not unintelligible to the average reader. We do not wonder to find certain self-starting English reviewers who have gone after the book with sharp criticism, of which the point of departure is this double or general purpose of the book. With such exceptions, the work has been given a hearty welcome in every quarter.

Our brief notice will not permit of examination of the book in detail. As a whole it seems to us the most satisfactory work of its kind that has yet appeared. The author has held admirably to his purpose of presenting French literature as a whole, restricting schools and movements to their proper compass in the general plan. He has ridden no hobbies, albeit he has at times shown scant respect for the respect of others. We believe that he has done well to go back to the plan of division by centuries, as he believes that in France the end of the century often coincides with a change in the national spirit and the literary tendencies.

The author has been notably successful in tracing the intimate relation that has existed in every period of French literature, and perhaps more strikingly in France than elsewhere, between the literature and the contemporary thought and social forces. Nowhere is this better done than in his long and comprehensive treatment of the literary movements of the nineteenth century, or in his brilliant chapter upon the tendencies of the twentieth. He has not shied at discussing the Dreyfus case, Bergsonism, and Modernism, in their relation to the literature of to-day.

Two admirable features of the book are the bibliography and a list and classification of the more noteworthy living authors. The bibliography is divided into two sections, the first comprising more general indications for the survey of periods, and the second being a systematic bibliography, "not exhaustive but selective," "intended to designate, for the benefit of foreign students working at long range, the most useful critical and biographical studies." We find included even such usual heads

as early printed and rare books, and lists of literary reviews and journals. Such will be welcomed by American teachers in remote places—like the seats of some of our state universities, for example. We wish Professor Wright had gone still further in his innovations and had given us absolute ratings of authorities, after the manner of Bradsteet.

BERT E. YOUNG.

---

THE PEOPLE OF GOD: AN INQUIRY INTO CHRISTIAN ORIGINS. By H. F. Hamilton, D.D. In two volumes: I Israel; II The Church. New York: Henry Frowde. 1912.

In these two fascinating volumes we have a critical and historical study of the very first importance. Exceedingly liberal and entirely modern as is the treatment of his subject by Dr. Hamilton, the result of his inquiry is nevertheless synthetic and constructive. To attempt any adequate indication of the contents and method of this remarkable work would require many pages. It must suffice us to give but a hint or two of the treasure laid up for the careful reader. In volume one the author first analyzes the origin and rise of Greek monotheism out of polytheism, as the result of philosophical inquiry into the phenomena of nature and their causation. Next he examines into the origin of Hebrew monothesisim and compares it with the Greek. The development of the idea of the one holy All-Ruler of Israel from out of the notion of a tribal deity is traced in detail, with strong emphasis on the spiritual experiences of the prophets as the most potent factor in the progress towards "mono-Yahwism." The positive value of the Jewish religion and relation thereto of the Messianic hope is then considered, and volume one concludes with a firm expression of opinion that our Lord Jesus Christ accepted the religion of His people as of divine sanction and authority, and at the same time claimed the authority to replace the old by a new covenant, of a higher and wider character, for an enlarged and expanded 'People of God.'

In volume two, Dr. Hamilton treats of the Foundation of the Church, the Development of the Ministry, and the Unity of the Church. Under these three general heads he discusses the relation of the Apostles to the religion of their own people, the

Jews; the Church as the New Israel; the office of the Apostles in the Early Church at Jerusalem and in the churches founded by St. Paul; the relations of Presbyters to the Apostles; The Episcopate; and the Organization and Organic Functions of the Church. Much has been written on the general subject of Christian Origins. Dr. Hamilton's treatment of the material under investigation, however, is not only up-to-date and scholarly, but sympathetic, impartial, and positive. His conclusions are reached by patient, exact, and thoroughly critical methods. In many respects they will prove a surprise to those who have been accustomed to swallow without examination the superficial theories hastily promulgated by many of those who claim a monopoly of exact scholarship as to the beginning of the Christian Church and its Ministry. Dr. Hamilton's masterly work should have a wide circle of readers, and his arguments and conclusion should be weighed and pondered by all those who long for the reunion of Christendom. HENRY R. GUMMEY.

---

THE PRAYER BOOK DICTIONARY. Edited by George Harford, M.A., and Morley Stevenson, M.A., assisted by J. W. Tyrer, M.A. Preface by the Lord Bishop of Liverpool. Crown 4-to, half leather gilt, gilt top. pp. 852. New York: Longmans, Green, & Company. \$8.50 net.

It is to be hoped that this handsome volume will receive a hearty welcome beyond the immediate circle of students to whom it makes its primary appeal. For no thoughtful person questions the far-spreading influence of the Book of Common Prayer, not only as the standard model of Divine worship wherever our mother tongue is spoken, but also as a potent example of terse and vigorous English, second only to the authorized version of the English Bible, in its moulding effect upon our common speech. Familiar, however, though the Prayer Book is to most persons, their knowledge of its history, its rationale and contents and of its environment of law and art and music, is usually very scanty and imperfect. This is owing, in large measure, to the fact that up to the present time no book of reference covering all the ground mentioned had appeared, and thus an accurate, comprehensive, intelligent conception of the Prayer Book and its setting has remained the possession of a

comparatively small number of expert liturgical scholars. No student of English history or literature has any excuse, now for ignorance, or for imperfect or erroneous notions as to the Book of Common Prayer and any matter relevant to it. In the eight hundred and fifty pages of the *Prayer Book Dictionary* will be found stored, not merely accurate historical, legal, and antiquarian data, but also ample consideration of such practical and ethical topics as are involved in the system of worship which the Book of Common Prayer enshrines and expresses. The *Prayer Book Dictionary* is a compact, well-edited reference library and fills a want long felt and long unsatisfied. It should find a place among the standard dictionaries and books of reference on the shelves of all our public libraries, and not least, of our universities and high schools throughout the land.

HENRY R. GUMMEY.

---

THE MEDIEVAL MIND. By H. O. Taylor. Two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Mr. Taylor is bold enough to emancipate himself from the specialist limitations that the modern historical school has imposed upon itself, and his two volumes on the History of Mediæval Thought recall in their aim and method the achievements of the great writers of the eighteenth century. Montesquieu covered the whole field of law; Vico the whole field of history; Buffon the whole field of zoölogy. It is with such models that one must compare Mr. Taylor's broad and comprehensive study. Debatable subjects suitable for dissertations or forming a ground-work for a special treatise occur on almost every page. Avenues of thought are constantly touched upon which the worker in specialist erudition has hardly yet exploited. The wide sphere of mediæval achievement in the varied channels of intellectual interpretation and literary expression is all brought under review.

Mr. Taylor finds a place in his narrative for scholastic philosophers and jurists, but he does not fail to tell his reader also about *Parsifal* and the Troubadors. Complete mastery of all of these subjects is impossible, and no one would be foolish enough to submit a work of this kind to the standards that are

set by such works as Lea's *Inquisition*, or Ficker's *Rechtsgeschichte Italiens*. Mr. Taylor's work is beyond all question a production which satisfies the general need of educated people who cannot possibly afford the time and who have not the qualifications to devote themselves to the broad-ways, much less the by-ways of mediæval literary history. Wherever Mr. Taylor's views are tested it will be found that his generalizations are remarkably sound and show an honest desire to reach an independent and definite conclusion expressed in such clear language as will interpret the point of view of mediæval literature in terms fashioned to harmonize with the modern standards of criticism.

The chapters on mediæval poetry will be found most suggestive, although many will regret that the Celtic Lyric has not been included in the survey. The difficult subject of mediæval philosophy cannot be presented without technical training on the part of the author, and without demanding from the public a technical preparation that is impossible to secure. Therefore, it may be considered captious to say that Mr. Taylor's discussion of scholasticism is very far from being adequate. In two volumes which cover so long a period and so many subjects it is not very surprising to run across some actual bits of misinformation. For example, it is intimated that Boethius was a Christian. This point is, of course, much disputed by modern critics. Later on, Mr. Taylor leaves the reader with the idea that the Benedictine Rule was generally victorious throughout the early Middle Ages. Such a suggestion leaves out of account both the monastic movement under St. Nilus in Central and Southern Italy and also the widespread popularity of the rule used by the Augustinian Canons throughout Western Europe. It is curious, too, sometimes to find, in Mr. Taylor's translations of Mediæval Latin, blunders in the English rendering of very simple phrases. In one instance, *Ratio* is treated as a masculine substantive. In others, familiar particles, such as *cum* and *ut* in subjunctive construction, are defectively rendered. The probability is that the drudgery of translation work was assigned by the author to some subordinate helper who has showed anything but adequate mastery of ordinary Latin construction.

One of the most satisfactory and illuminating portions of the book deals with the subject of hermit life, with an account of ascetic women visionaries. The treatment of symbolism, too, is admirable, in which the connection is traced between the theory in Hugo of St. Victor and its concrete presentation in Durandus. Much less satisfactory are the chapters on mediæval education, for a number of typical names are not to be found in it, and Mr. Taylor's account of the origin and development of mediæval universities, and especially his presentation of the struggle between the mendicant orders and the University of Paris, seem to show that he has not read either Denifle or Rashdall with sufficient care.

As a specimen passage illustrative of Mr. Taylor's ability to sum up the characteristics of the mediæval spirit, the following deserves attention: "A spirit," he calls it, "which stood in awe before its monitors divine and human and deemed that knowledge was to be drawn from the storehouse of the past; which seemed to rely on everything except its sin-crushed self and trusted everything except its senses; which in the actual looked for the ideal, in the concrete saw the symbol, in the earthly church beheld the heaven, and in the fleshly joys discerned the devil's lures; which lived in the unreconciled opposition between the lust and vain-glory of earth and attainment of salvation; which felt life's terror and its pitifulness and its eternal hope; around which waved concrete infinitude and over which flamed the terror of darkness and the Judgment Day."

W. L. B.

---

SCIENCE AND RELIGION IN CONTEMPORARY PHILOSOPHY. By E. Boutroux. Translated by Jonathan Niel. New York: The Macmillan Co.

This is an exceptionally successful study in an exceptionally tangled set of relationships. The thesis of the author is not very clear; but his presentation of the problem and of the attitude of recent philosophy toward science and religion is really masterly. Perhaps it is rather unfair to expect that any single thinker should keep a perfect balance between age-old religion, having its basis in man's emotional nature, and modern science which

cares for nothing but facts. It is, however, necessary that somehow a synthesis of science and religion should be accomplished, for after all, the phenomena of religion are just as much facts, and certainly much more widely recognized facts, than any chemical reaction, and it is to the trained thinkers, whom we call philosophers, that we must turn for help in this task of readjustment. Let us hope that we shall in the near future have another similar contribution from M. Boutroux or from some other equally illuminating author. W. S.

---

GODSECK ET JÉSUS-CHRIST EN FLANDRE. By Honoré de Balzac. Edited by R. T. Holbrook. New York and London: Oxford University Press, American Branch. pp. 198+xxv. 1913.

This is the first edited text in the Oxford French Series which was mentioned in a preceding notice. Professor Holbrook has selected two masterpieces of the great realist that have never before been made available for school use. The excellent introduction gives the characteristic facts of the author's life, while the notes cover the wide allusion and rich idiom that are always the difficulty in Balzac's style. A novel feature is an index that refers to all important matters in the notes, as well as to particularly interesting words and locutions. B. E. Y.

---

ADDIO, MADRETTA AND OTHER PLAYS. By Stark Young. Chicago: Charles H. Sergel & Co.

This volume contains plays very diverse in subject and in treatment; the first two, from which the book is named, are set in the America of to-day, the others in more remote or fanciful places. All, however, are alike in being filled with the spirit of romance and poetry. The style is good; the craftsmanship excellent; and the feeling throughout is earnest, reaching perhaps its highest point of tension in the last play, *The Queen of Sheba*. Some of the themes portrayed are so great in their nature that fuller treatment would probably give them a clearer and more adequate expression; but the plays themselves would not need nor endure expansion or compression. G. T.